plished this week. When I say "commend the Senate," I include both Republicans and Democrats.

We have passed to date something on the order of six or seven appropriation bills. We recently passed the bank merger bill and the area redevelopment bill. We passed this week 57 bills on the call of the calendar. We disposed of two conference reports, in connection with the appropriation bills for the Commerce Department and the Department of the Interior. We have also passed a mutual security bill, and will have the conference report before us before too long. We also passed a space bill, with an authorization for an appropriation covering a sizable sum.

It is anticipated that in the days ahead the Senate will take action on wage-hour legislation, on medical aid, and on a Federal employees' pay increase. We hope to pass a good farm bill, a good housing bill, and a good social security bill. I dare say that from the Committee on the Judiciary will come an immigration bill.

So, on the basis of the record made so far, and especially on the basis of the record made this week, I think the Senate is to be commended for the application and the diligence it has shown, as well as for the legislation itself; and certainly, before this session is completed, we shall take care of the other measures to which I have called the attention of the Senate.

I think special credit should go to the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and to the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. They worked together in bringing much of this legislation before the Senate for consideration; and because of the fact that they were able to work out agreements covering the bringing up of these measures, Congress as a whole is entitled to credit for the good work done this week.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 9, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 6, 1960:

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Cornelius W. Wickersham, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York for the term of 4 years, vice Leonard P. Moore, resigned.

Louis B. Blissard, of Hawaii, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Hawaii for the term of 4 years, vice a new position.

U.S. MARSHAL

Thomas R. Clark, of Hawaii, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Hawaii for the term of 4 years, vice a new position.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeon

Henry H. Kyle

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Robert J. Lucas
Joe T. Hillsman
Samuel J. Wycoff
Francis O. Webb

To be assistant dental surgeons

Charles C. Swoope, Jr.
Gerald W. Gaston
William E. Dorrill
Richard L. Christiansen
George N. Newton
Wellesley H. Wright
Jim D. Webb
William L. Knudson
Richard K. Fred
David A. Dutton
Franz P. Helm
Buckner S. Burch
Manuel H. Marks
Orlen N. Johnson
Gresham T. Farrar, Jr.
Donald R. Swatman

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Ian K. Burgess

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Laurette M. Beck
Patricia P. Grimaila

To be assistant nurse officer

Juanita M. Barkley

To be junior assistant nurse officer

Ray Cameron

IN THE ARMY

To be Assistant Surgeon General

Col. Joseph Leroy Bernier, O20093, Dental Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Army, as major general, Dental Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3040, 3442, and 3447.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Richard Steinbach, O18560, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Howard Allen Morris, O20141, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas DeForth Rogers, O19351, U.S. Army.

Col. Seymour Austin Potter, Jr., O29937, U.S. Army.

U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Lt. Col. Virgil J. O'Connor, 6357A, for appointment as permanent registrar of the U.S. Air Force Academy, under the provisions of section 9333(c), title 10, United States Code.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Edwin M. Bradley, AO3074753.
Roy C. Ezell, AO3043809.
Orville L. Langford, AO2245814.
Felix R. Portelli, AO3076094.
Emerson K. Wirtz, AO3010978.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Loy L. Julius, AO689060.
Lucius L. Robinson, AO2239975.
Eugene J. Stoebenau, AO3076478.

To be captain, USAF (Veterinary)

Farrel R. Robinson, AO2239021.

To be captains, USAF (nurse)

Alvira L. Clemetson, AN2214429.
Mary A. Flenner, AN2241978.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

James D. Deacon, AO3089053.
Thomas O. English, Jr., AO3089278.
Dale C. Metheny, AO3089279.
Harry A. Schwamm, AO1852529.
Robert S. White, AO3091126.
Frank W. Zimmerman, Jr., AO3089110.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Dental)

John C. Helder, AO3089310.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (nurse)

Phyllis J. Carter, AN2243052.
Pauline K. Dabkiewicz, AN3075714.
Evelyn G. Richardson, AN2243541.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be first lieutenants

Leroy G. Cuny, AO3054943.
Stephen W. Gilbert, AO3066756.
Richard H. Hartke, AO3055720.
Charles W. Hooker, AO3054239.
Wendell R. Keller, AO3067915.
Allan J. Kelly, AO3068726.
Elery P. Morphew, AO3054688.
Don A. Patterson, AO3067742.
Ray A. Perry, AO3054866.
Earl C. Ruby, Jr., AO3055758.
John E. Ruonala, AO3070406.
James B. Sevebeck, AO3068826.
Harold C. Smith, AO3055023.
James D. Staten, AO3066607.
John C. Tynan, AO3069420.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

John W. Carlson
Robert W. Corcoran
William F. Lawrence
Robert F. Mullen
Albert M. Salem, Jr.

The following-named cadets, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284 of title 10, United States Code. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Donald Joseph Stukel
Thomas Allen Walker

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 6, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 27: 1: *The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? the Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, as Thou hast set before us an unknown day and an untraveled way, wilt Thou

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

open our minds and hearts widely to Thy kindly light to lead us and Thy divine strength to sustain us.

Grant that we may be men and women of insight and understanding, whose life and labors, in the vast upheaval of these perilous days, are illumined and girded with a great faith, confident that Thou wilt have Thy way with us and our troubled world.

May nothing obscure or eclipse the prophet's vision of that glorious day when nations shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks and neither shall they learn war anymore.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1217. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duty on certain amorphous graphite;

H.R. 1456. An act for the relief of Universal Trades, Inc.;

H.R. 1752. An act for the relief of Wilhelmina Ordonez;

H.R. 2082. An act for the relief of James Demetrios Chrysanthes, also known as James Demetrios Chrysanthacopoulos;

H.R. 3786. An act for the relief of Chan Kit Ying and James George Bainter;

H.R. 3934. An act for the relief of Mrs. E. Christine Williams;

H.R. 4562. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Grzelewski;

H.R. 4825 An act for the relief of Jean K. Simmons;

H.R. 5349. An act to provide for the conveyance to Orange County, Calif., of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Orange County, Calif.;

H.R. 6083. An act for the relief of Mary V. Jones;

H.R. 6493. An act for the relief of Robert Dolton;

H.R. 6843. An act for the relief of Daniel Wilging;

H.R. 7226. An act for the relief of Mr. Hughie D. Martin and Ione Martin;

H.R. 7254. An act for the relief of Simeen Helena Chaghaghi;

H.R. 7363. An act for the relief of Chester A. Spindler;

H.R. 8280. For the relief of Clarence T. Tolpo;

H.R. 8383. An act for the relief of Maj. Jack E. Hudson;

H.R. 8456. An act for the relief of Capt. Jack Rubley;

H.R. 8672. An act for the relief of Dr. Deh Chang Tao;

H.R. 8868. An act for the relief of the Albertson Water District, Nassau County, N.Y.;

H.R. 8941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice Anderson;

H.R. 9216. An act for the relief of Daniel C. Turner;

H.R. 9464. An act to remove the requirement that, of the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Ships, one must be specially qualified and experienced in naval engineering and the other must be specially qualified and experienced in naval architecture;

H.R. 9476. An act for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson;

H.R. 9760. An act for the relief of Sam Doolittle;

H.R. 10164. An act to change the name of the locks and dam No. 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky.;

H.R. 10550. An act to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 2 additional years; and

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing of the final report of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1607. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anne Morgan;

H.R. 4029. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm;

H.R. 6779. An act to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals);

H.R. 8241. An act to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to the reemployment of former Members of Congress;

H.R. 9308. An act to extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory;

H.R. 9465. An act to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China;

H.R. 9862. An act to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing; and

H.J. Res. 640. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1349. An act for the relief of Song Tai Song;

S. 1857. An act to promote the foreign trade of the United States in grapes and plums, to protect the reputation of American-grown grapes and plums in foreign markets, to prevent deception or misrepresentation as to the quality of such products moving in foreign commerce, to provide for the commercial inspection of such products entering such commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 2087. An act for the relief of Janis Papulis;

S. 2369. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kato;

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Halina Konik Wojtusiak;

S. 2528. An act for the relief of John Lipset;

S. 2575. An act to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government;

S. 2618. An act to authorize the exchange of certain war-built vessels for more modern and efficient war-built vessels owned by the United States;

S. 2627. An act for the relief of Nicholas Anthony Marcantonakis;

S. 2635. An act for the relief of Maria Genowefa Kon Musial;

S. 2739. An act for the relief of Yu Sui Ling, also known as Yee Shui Ling;

S. 2769. An act for the relief of John George Sarkis Lindell;

S. 2792. An act for the relief of Luigia Mion;

S. 2821. An act for the relief of Kristina Selan;

S. 2822. An act for the relief of Low Wing Quey (Kwai);

S. 2833. An act for the relief of Sadako Suzuki;

S. 2857. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for refunds of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such act;

S. 2886. An act for the relief of Nikolija Lazic;

S. 2923. An act for the relief of Ki Su (Theresa) Moun;

S. 2966. An act for the relief of Antigone Apostolaki Cassel;

S. 2969. An act to authorize the award posthumously of appropriate medals to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington;

S. 3081. An act for the relief of Irena Maria Koller;

S. 3114. An act for the relief of Adolphe Herstein;

S. 3327. An act for the relief of Jean Goedicke; and

S. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate (S. 722) of the following title: "An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10401) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961."

The message also announced that the Senate requests the return to the Senate of the bill (H.R. 5421) entitled "An act to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes."

The message also announced the appointment of the Senator from Iowa, [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], to represent the Senate on the official delegation of the American Battle Monuments Commission to dedicate six of the World War II American military cemeteries in Europe during the period July 4–25, 1960.

THE LATE MARTIN L. SWEENEY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce to the Members of the House

that the Honorable Martin L. Sweeney died in his sleep at his home in Westlake, a suburb of Cleveland. Martin Sweeney was my predecessor in Congress, representing the 20th Ohio District during the 72d through the 77th Congresses. Mr. Sweeney was a very colorful public figure. He served with distinction, with vigor, and devotion. He was a gentleman of strong character and firm convictions. He had served in the Ohio State Legislature in 1913–14 and served as a judge of the municipal court of Cleveland for 8 years preceding his election to Congress. Mr. Sweeney had been a public figure in Cleveland since 1912, and early in his career had won recognition by fighting for the principles in which he believed. He was a gifted orator. He had served as national president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

Mr. Sweeney had, in the past few years, retired from active participation in political affairs, but he had retained his keen interest in civic, national, and international affairs.

On April 15 Mr. Sweeney had observed his 75th birthday. To his widow, children, and grandchildren I extend my most sincere sympathy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was very sorry when I heard of the death of Martin Sweeney. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] has very ably presented in a broad way the life of our late friend and former colleague. Martin Sweeney was a dedicated American, an outstanding legislator, and a man of unusual ability. He was very colorful. He and I became close friends during his service in this body, a friendship which continued in the intervening years up to the time of his death. I join my friend from Ohio in extending to Mrs. Sweeney and her loved ones my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know Martin Sweeney in Cleveland, not politically but as a friend. He was very generous, very delightful, and as the majority leader has said, a most colorful person. I think we are going to miss him in Cleveland. We are going to miss that color. We are going to miss some of the things he was famous for. I thank my colleague from Ohio very much for permitting me to have this little word this morning, and to send my sympathy to Mrs. Sweeney and to the family.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I never had the pleasure of knowing the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Sweeney, but he must have been something of a prophet. On the occasion of a visit of the King and Queen of England to Washington a good many years ago, Government buildings were ordered closed, and he suggested that among those buildings that ought to be closed tight was the U.S. Treasury. He must have been something of a prophet because since that time billions of dollars have gone down the drain in uncollected so-called loans to the British.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and service of our former colleague, Martin Sweeney.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join my distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, in expressing sympathy at the untimely passing of the Honorable Martin L. Sweeney, former Member of Congress from the 20th District of Ohio, who was deceased on April 15.

During the years when the Honorable Martin L. Sweeney served in this Congress, between 1933 and 1944, he distinguished himself as an outspoken and dedicated crusader. He opposed political bosses and he opposed prohibition with equal zeal.

During his time in the Congress the Honorable Martin L. Sweeney was uniquely independent, both in thought and in action. He was colorful; he was challenging. During the troublesome days of the great depression he constantly endeavored to improve the plight of the people he represented.

Although he served the 20th Congressional District for 11 years, he was born in the district which I now represent.

I want to take this opportunity to extend words of comfort to his beloved wife, Mrs. Marie Sweeney, and his four devoted children.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last July the Congress passed Senate Joint Resolution 111 providing for the designation of the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week."

Under this resolution the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people to observe such a week with appropriate ceremonies.

I have written President Eisenhower to strongly urge that he issue a proclamation this year at this early date, showing that the freedom and independence of the unfortunate peoples of the world are especially in our minds at the time of the shooting down of our weather plane and in view of the forthcoming summit meeting.

Referring to this act of international banditry and the ensuing vitriolic verbal attack by Khrushchev on the United States, I can only say I favor something more than an official protest deploring the situation.

I would call off the President's visit to the Soviet Union and have the United States withdraw from the summit talks.

KENTUCKY DERBY

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, now that the Congress has just passed a bill making Louisville, Ky., a depressed area there is talk going on around the Hill about changing the name of the Kentucky Derby to the Depressed Areas Sweepstakes.

I hope that the thousands who attend this time-honored event in Louisville tomorrow will not grumble about Derby Day prices. The money they spend will be for a worthy cause. They will be aiding a depressed area.

SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower should call off the summit conference. If the President goes to this summit meeting following recent events, he will be at a tremendous disadvantage. Khrushchev has carefully created incidents so as to bargain with the President. The Chinese Communists have imprisoned Bishop Walsh. The Soviets shot down another one of our planes. They helped stir up riots in Korea and elsewhere in the world. The Communists threatened the Panama Canal and gave Castro military equipment. They created the Berlin crisis. Now Khrushchev wants to sit down with the President and offer the return of Bishop Walsh, temporarily cease to incite riots, curb Castro, and refrain from shooting down our planes, all in return for Berlin or some other surrender by the United States. We cannot possibly win peace or honor at such a

conference. Khrushchev steals Eisenhower's cow before a conference, then at the conference Khrushchev says, "I will return your cow if you give me the cow's calf." The calf is what Khrushchev wanted all along. Eisenhower has all to lose and nothing to gain. We can only win the respect of the world and restore dignity to the Office of the President by refusing to meet Khrushchev under such ridiculous and shocking circumstances. This is Khrushchev's game and if we continue to play it, the United States will lose. At every conference, we make concessions and surrender just a little more, while Khrushchev gives nothing. Under no circumstances should the United States dignify Khrushchev with a summit conference until he gives the captive nations their freedom. Khrushchev can end the cold war, simply by keeping Russian treaties and promises. There is nothing to talk about.

UNION-INDUSTRIAL SHOW AT NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to announce to the Members, which I do with pleasure, that today the Union-Industrial Show opens at the National Guard Army at 1 o'clock and continues through to May 11. The President opened the show and the ribbons were cut for one of the greatest union-labor-management shows in the world.

It is a fine example of cooperation between the workers and management when they get together and display their wonderful union label products and demonstrate efficient union services.

One hundred thousand dollars in prizes will be given away.

The exhibit is free—there will be no admission charge—no sale of goods on the floor.

Everyone is invited to view this marvelous exhibition.

Mr. Joseph Lewis is the director of the show which is sponsored by the Union-Labor and Services Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11713) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11713, with Mr. ALBERT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11713 is a bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1961. The bill follows the same general form as the AEC authorization bills for the past 4 fiscal years.

Section 101 authorizes $211,476,000 for new AEC construction projects. This compares with $293,876,000 requested by the AEC. In other words, the Joint Committee has reduced this bill by $82,400,000. A total of 39 line-item projects are listed in section 101 of the bill, covering all aspects of the AEC program.

Sections 102 through 106 of the bill contain standard provisions on "limitations"—section 102—"advanced planning and design"—section 103—"restoration or replacement"—section 104—"currently available funds"—section 105—and "substitutions"—section 106.

Section 107 of the bill is in the form requested by AEC and amends projects authorized by prior Authorization Acts. Project 57–d–1, the zero gradient synchrotron, Argonne National Laboratory, is increased from $27 million to $42 million, and project 60–e–12, alterations to Shippingport reactor facilities, is increased from $5 million to $9 million, in order to construct a heat sink, and to modify the reactor plant for operation at a power level equivalent of 150 electrical megawatts under PWR Core 2.

Section 108 of the bill rescinds certain projects previously authorized which are no longer considered necessary by the AEC or the Joint Committee. A total of seven projects would be rescinded, amounting to $18,290,000. I think this is a sound way to legislate, because in the experience of every Member, we authorize so many things that the departments fail to use, and we sometimes do not rescind the authorization.

Section 109 authorizes an additional $40 million funds, and $5 million waiver of use charge authority, for use in the cooperative power demonstration program under the conditions and limitations of previous applicable statutes. Of the $40 million in this section, $25 million is intended for construction of an intermediate sized organic-cooled prototype reactor, if no satisfactory proposal is received from industry under the third round, under the AEC Authorization Act for fiscal year 1960. If a satisfactory proposal should be received, AEC may construct, or support the construction of, some other reactor type deemed appropriate, such as a spectral shift reactor. The remaining $15 million under section 109 is available for research and development assistance for either unsolicited proposals or third round proposals, whichever may develop, such as the large scale powerplants reportedly under consideration by two California utility groups.

Section 110 authorized $5 million for use in the cooperative program with Canada for research and development in connection with heavy water moderated nuclear powerplants.

The bill contains severals changes recommended by the Joint Committee from the bill originally proposed by the AEC.

First, the committee added as project 61–d–10, $13 million for power reactor plants for the Antarctic. Testimony furnished the committee during the hearings indicated the extremely high cost of fuel in the Antarctic, as well as the fact that many lives and equipment have been lost in the transportation process. The $13 million authorization could provide for construction of three or four small atomic powerplants in the Antarctic which would enhance our international prestige in that area, would help develop the reactor art, and would result in eventual savings to the taxpayers because of lower operating costs.

Secondly, the majority of the committee recommends, in project 61–f–7, $3 million for design and engineering of the linear electron accelerator at Stanford University, rather than the $107,200,000 construction authorization requested by AEC. The majority believes that the design and engineering authorization will allow the project to go ahead on an adequate basis and will result in better cost estimates before construction is authorized. The project came to us at a very late date. We are concerned with the history of rising costs in the high energy physics program, and the changes that have been made in this particular accelerator. The committee has requested that an overall report on the high energy physics program, and more data on this proposed accelerator, be submitted by AEC to the Joint Committee by next January 1961. We believe that the Congress would then be in a better position to consider the requested $107,200,000 construction authorization.

I do not think anyone quite realizes here in this body the amount of research that has been necessary under the AEC as well as in the Armed Forces. But I see somewhat the same situation developing here today that we had in the days immediately after World War II when we had no plans whatever and we had virtually no wind tunnels in this country. We even moved one from Germany when we got to Dortmund and Peenemunde. We moved it here to Carderock, Md. Then we had a great flurry of activity and all the agencies involved wanted wind tunnels, particularly the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. So we had to devise a program in this field to save money for the Government. NACA did more for the development of science in this country than any other agency although their activities have now been transferred to the new agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This accelerator problem is somewhat similar to the wind tunnel situation. We have built some of those accelerators in this country.

I have here a list of the high energy accelerators in operation and under construction which I include as a part of my remarks at this point:

High-energy accelerators—In operation

DOMESTIC

Machine	Energy (Bev.)	Intensity	Particles	Location
Synchrotron	1.4	Average	Electron	California Institute of Technology.
Do	1.5	do	do	Cornell University.
Do	3.0	do	Proton	Brookhaven National Laboratory.
Do	6.2	do	do	University of California.

FOREIGN

Synchrotron	1.0	Average	Proton	University of Birmingham, United Kingdom.
Do	1.2	do	Electron	Rome, Italy.
Do	3.0	do	Proton	Saclay, France.
Do	10.0	Low	do	Dubna, U.S.S.R.
Do	28.0	Average	do	CERN, Geneva, Switzerland.

High energy accelerators—Under construction

DOMESTIC

Machine	Energy (Bev.)	Intensity	Particles	Location
Synchrotron	3.0	High	Proton	Princeton University.
Do	6.0	do	Electron	Cambridge, Mass.
Do	12.5	do	Proton	Argonne National Laboratory.
Do	25–30	Average	do	Brookhaven National Laboratory.

FOREIGN

Linear accelerator	1.0	Average	Electron	Saclay, France.
Synchrotron	1.0	do	Proton	Delft, Netherlands.
Do	1.2	do	Electron	Lund, Sweden.
Do	1.3	do	do	Tokyo, Japan.
Linear accelerator	4.0	(?)	do	Kharkov, U.S.S.R.
Synchrotron	7.0	Average	Proton	Harwell, United Kingdom.
Do	7.0	do	do	Moscow, U.S.S.R.
Do	7.5	High	Electron	Hamburg, Germany.
Do	10.6	Very low	Proton	Canberra, Australia.
Do	50.0	(?)	do	Moscow, U.S.S.R.

In the free world, in foreign countries which we have access to for this high energy physics research work, we have available to us one which I believe is 30 bev and several more linear accelerators.

This is almost too theoretical a subject to discuss because of its technical complexity. I am not opposed to going on with this project in an orderly fashion. I think we ought to go into all promising research work in the accelerator field, both in regard to heavy particles and light particles.

As I said, I am not opposed to any of these projects. I made the motion to put $3 million in here and let AEC come back with a thorough study to show this body exactly what it is going to cost. We started out with another accelerator, on which we estimated a cost of $15 million. But as of today we have authorized around $40 million or $42 million and we may not be through yet.

So I feel very much the same way about this item as I did about the wind tunnels. When I found out that the wind tunnels were going to use as much power as the city of New York, I thought it time to come in and take a look at them. We adopted a unified control plan and it is working out fine. It gives us all the information which I think is necessary. We have an installation, of course, in Virginia, with a wind tunnel. We have some in other parts of the country, one at Wright-Patterson Field and in that section. We have some more. I think we set up a sound program when we pooled this thing.

I think we are going to have to do something similar in the accelerator field because it is an expensive area of research. I do not have the estimated cost of operation of the ones we have in operation today but it is in the hearings. I do not have it before me. I can see, of course, that we are going to run into considerable money here unless we use a sound approach in developing this field.

I am not opposed to it. Nobody can accuse me of playing politics on these items in all my years in Congress, some 22 years or more. If they have a sound approach, if they have the physicists and other personnel, and have good cost estimates, I am not opposed to it.

Also, the committee added two projects to the AEC-proposed bill, and both of them are in the basic research field.

Project 61–f–8, $5.6 million for construction of a materials research laboratory at the University of Illinois and project 61–f–9, $2.2 million for the construction of a radiation laboratory at the University of Notre Dame.

Both of these projects were requested by the AEC Division of Research but were eliminated during the budget process. The Joint Committee believes that intensified laboratory work and research in the two important areas of materials and radiation effects will be of great benefit to the atomic energy program. The work would take place in the universities. It has been my position from the beginning that we should emphasize placing research in the hands of the universities.

The committee also increased the amount for project 61–h–1, facilities in the biomedical research field, from $4 million to $5 million, in order to intensify research efforts in the field of radiation, including effects of radioactive fallout.

Well, we know of the fine work that has been done in cancer research in this field. There is no use arguing about this. I think we could use much more money, but we did increase it $1 million.

I want to say here that I do not believe a group of more dedicated scientists in the field of biomedical research exists today than exists in the agency of the AEC and its laboratories and contractors. They have done a fine job, and we should support them. We all know of the hazards of radiation, and I think we should know all there is to know about it.

In summary, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through its Subcommittee on Legislation, has held detailed hearings on every project and provision in the bill. The subcommittee and the full Joint Committee gave the bill very careful consideration, making a few revisions, and reducing the total amount authorized from $293,876,000 to $211,476,000, or a net reduction of $82,400,000. We believe that the actions of the Joint Committee, and the reasons for these actions, are thoroughly explained in our committee report, House Report No. 1277, which is available to all our colleagues in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to vote for H.R. 11713, in the form recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask the gentleman if there is a provision in this bill for the reactor that was proposed in the Antarctic.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. MONAGAN. That is included in the bill?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. MONAGAN. I compliment the committee. I think it is a very progressive policy, and it should save a lot of money, as I understand it.

Mr. DURHAM. Well, it is discretionary, of course. They can build three or four or whatever they need within the $13 million figure. The reactors can be readily manufactured in the United States. All we have to do is to transport them there, and thereby save a lot of money, instead of paying $7 a gallon for fuel oil.

Mr. MONOGAN. There will be a tremendous saving in fuel oil alone.

Mr. DURHAM. In the long run we will save considerable money. As I said in my previous remarks, I do not see that we can do otherwise, and I think we should go ahead and provide these three.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I know that I speak the sentiments of all the Members of the House when I say that we regret very much that our distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], has announced that he will not run for reelection next fall. There is no man, in my opinion, who has ever served in this body who has made a more sincere and profound impression upon his colleagues and upon the legislative history of our country than my sweet and lovable friend from North Carolina, who is a dedicated legislator. The gentleman has always conducted himself with outstanding ability, with vision, and with great courage, but over and above that he has always been a gentleman. I keenly regret that the gentleman has made the decision which he has, because in the world of today, with the international menace that confronts our country and the world as a whole, particularly the free world, we need in the Halls of Congress men with the ability and the experience and the outlook and the character and the leadership of my dear friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

I am not going to start anything, but I certainly would be pleased if a grassroots campaign started in the gentleman's district, urging him to continue his service in this body.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished majority leader very much. It is very kind of him to make those remarks. I have had the privilege and honor of serving with him over many years, and have long admired his leadership and courage, going back to the early days of the Manhattan District in World War II.

I suppose this will be probably the last authorization bill that I shall handle on the floor of the House. I want to say to this body that the support which they have given us in these many years in developing the very complicated field of atomic energy, the military developments which, under civilian control, have helped to keep the peace of the world, has meant a great deal to me and to all the members of our committee. I am sure the Members of this body will continue to look upon this as one of the first needs in our national defense and in the security of the free world, as well as recognizing the necessity for the peaceful development of the atom.

I hope I have contributed something, may I say to our distinguished majority leader, through my years of service in the House. I have enjoyed my service on the committees of the House. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has especially offered a challenge. I have appreciated the fine cooperation and association with CHET HOLIFIELD and MEL PRICE, as well as my other old associate from the start of the committee, JIM VAN ZANDT. Our newer members of the Joint Committee—WAYNE ASPINALL and ALBERT THOMAS; and CRAIG HOSMER, BILL BATES, and JACK WESTLAND—have also been most kind and considerate. The Members of the other body on the Joint Committee have also been very cooperative.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to make a general statement concerning H.R. 11713, the bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1961.

At a later time, my colleague, Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, will offer an amendment, which I support, to authorize construction of the linear electron accelerator, as requested by the President and the AEC.

Before commencing my statement on this bill, I would like to say a few words in commendation of the distinguished vice chairman of our committee, Congressman CARL DURHAM, who has announced his retirement at the end of this session. CARL DURHAM and I have served together since creation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in 1946. He has conscientiously served the committee and the Congress, and we, on this side of the aisle, are very sorry to see him leave us. We wish him many happy future years after he retires to join his family and many friends in Chapel Hill, N.C., and we hope that he will come back often to see his old colleagues on the Joint Committee and in the Congress.

I would also like to commend another "plank owner" on the Joint Committee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, who has worked hard, as he always does, on the provisions of this bill to make them acceptable to him. Although we differ on the method of authorizing one important project, as recommended by his subcommittee, and later by the full committee, we realize that differences are possible on such a major project, and we hope that he and his colleagues on the other side of the aisle will eventually come around to our point of view with respect to the Stanford accelerator.

Supplementing Mr. DURHAM's remarks, I would like to comment on a few of the most important projects in the bill.

Subsection 101(a) of this bill covers the necessary new construction projects for the AEC special nuclear materials program, including projects at Fernald, Ohio; Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Hanford, Wash.; Savannah River, S.C.; and other AEC plants. Project 61–a–1 authorizes $10 million to provide flexibility for new construction projects as they may develop during the course of the year.

Subsections 101 (b) and (c) lists four new construction projects in the atomic weapons field, to provide our AEC laboratories with the necessary facilities to keep up their vitally important work. Included as project 61–b–1 is a $10 million authorization, which again provides flexibility to meet new requirements as they may develop.

Subsections 101 (d) and (e) contain a total of 13 reactor development projects, including project 61–d–7, test installation for Project Rover, $20 million, and project 61–d–8, test installation for Project Pluto, $15 million. The costs of these two programs have been going up, and costs for future years are still undetermined, but to date our committee and the Congress have been very generous in making available funds without insisting on detailed cost justifications.

Subsections 101 (f) and (g) contain a total of 11 physical research projects, including improvements to the Princeton-Pennsylvania accelerator—project 61–f–2, $10,820,000—and to the bevatron at Lawrence Radiation Laboratory—project 61–f–6, $9,600,000. Project 61–f–7 contains only a "design and engineering" authorization, rather than a construction authorization, for the linear electron accelerator at Stanford University.

We will offer an amendment to project 61–f–7 later this afternoon because we believe that the $3 million "design and engineering" authorization is not sufficient for work to proceed on the items which are needed now—site preparation, construction of the klystron test laboratory, and construction of working space to house scientists and engineers to work on the project. A limited "design and engineering" authorization will delay commencement of useful experiments, and will result in eventual higher costs, as we shall point out in more detail later this afternoon.

I would like to stress our competition with Soviet Russia in this field. We are competing with the Russians in an overall scientific race for men's minds, and for future accomplishments in areas which command worldwide attention. High-energy physics is one area where we are now ahead, where we have made most of the outstanding discoveries, but where the Soviets are anxious to catch up. The key to the future has always come from basic research, and I regret to see our efforts, especially our congressional support, slacken for even one step. Extensive basic research tools are admittedly necessary to come in first in this race. The Russians are spending money in this area, and will continue to do so. In our separate views to the committee report—House Report No. 1525, pages 19–29—we pointed out:

> The Stanford accelerator would permit exploration into a new field (light, charged particles at high energy) not now adequately covered by the U.S. high-energy physics program or that of any other nation. By going ahead with this research tool, our scientists will be in a position, we feel, to make discoveries that will bring our country distinction in a highly competitive field among scientists throughout the world, including Russia.
>
> The Russians have three accelerators scheduled to start up in 1960 and 1961, including a 2-Bev electron linear accelerator planned at Kharkov, and they have announced a 4-Bev electron linear accelerator planned for construction at Kharkov. Even discounting the Russian claims, the Stanford 10- to 20-Bev accelerator would be the acknowledged leader in this dynamic area of science, and would offer opportunity for some positive U.S. firsts.
>
> The Stanford accelerator will also round out our program by giving a better balance between light particle (electron) and heavy particle (proton) accelerators.

With respect to the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University, it has been unanimously recom-

mended by a panel of distinguished scientists, and I quote from the letter dated February 5, 1960, reprinted at pages 27–29 of our separate views:

> In particular, this panel wishes to reaffirm its recommendation to start immediately the construction of the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University, and to express its concern about the delay which has been encountered in authorizing this machine to date. All the experimental potentialities of this machine, which the panel foresaw last year, still look as attractive as they did then. In addition, new potentialities have developed for which this high-intensity, high-energy, electron machine is well suited.

When our amendment is offered, I hope it will merit the support of members of the House from both sides of the aisle.

Returning now to the other projects and provisions of this bill, subsection 101(h) of the bill contains $5 million for installations for support of biomedical research, an increase of $1 million over the amount requested.

Subsection 101(i) authorizes three community projects at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and subsection 101(j) authorizes funds for general plant projects, under the limitations of subsection 102(c).

Congressman DURHAM, the vice chairman of the committee, has already explained sections 102 through 106, which contain standard provisions.

As for section 107(b), I am happy that AEC and the other interested parties have agreed on the method of operation for the second core of the Shippingport PWR reactor. The second core will be operated at an equivalent of 150,000 electrical kilowatts, and some of the heat energy will be dissipated through a new heat sink. Admiral Rickover testified before our committee that this method of operation will permit us to obtain all the valuable data—in fact, our ability to obtain data will be enhanced—page 182 of the hearings.

Section 109 of the bill authorizes $40 million for the cooperative power reactor demonstration program. This is the amount requested by the AEC, and I believe that it is a proper amount for a well-balanced civilian atomic power development program during the next year.

Section 110 of the bill authorizes $5 million for use in a cooperative program with Canada for research and development in connection with heavy water moderated nuclear powerplants. Under the proposed arrangements with Canada, the United States will be able to obtain for use by the AEC and U.S. industry all the engineering and economic information developed under the Canadian program, including drawings, plans, specifications, and all other technical data. The $5 million authorized will be spent in this country, mostly at AEC laboratories. In my opinion, this is a very sensible and businesslike way to proceed, in cooperation with our Canadian friends, to obtain data on heavy water moderated reactors.

Section 111 of the bill authorizes certain design and engineering studies and provides that the Commission may submit reports on such studies to the joint committee by April 1, 1961.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, this bill covers authorization of projects for our entire atomic energy program. The minority will offer an important amendment a little later. That amendment will be for a high-energy physics project unanimously recommended by our scientists. We will ask our colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, to reverse the committee action, and to support the scientists, and to authorize now the proposed Stanford linear electron accelerator.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I join the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the ranking member of the Joint Committee on the minority side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], in paying tribute to the vice chairman of the Joint Committee, who was the first Member of the House to serve as chairman of the Joint Committee, back in 1952. He subsequently served another term as chairman of the Joint Committee, and that term was distinguished by a progressive and a fine record of the committee.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has been interested in laboratories and scientific achievements of the country not only during his period of service on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy but he has concentrated in this area also in his work on the House Committee on Armed Services.

He vitally has concerned himself with the success of laboratories in the National Advisory Committee on Aviation and the National Science Foundation, and it was his great knowledge in this field that prompted the various chairmen of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Military Affairs that preceded the Committee on Armed Services in always designating him as the chairman of subcommittees having to do with legislation dealing with scientific matters involving our Armed Forces and our national defense. I doubt if there is a greater expert in the House on the subject of wind tunnels. I know that through his great efforts millions of dollars have been saved to the taxpayers as a result of the coordination of this program of development of wind tunnels.

Mr. Chairman, I rise particularly this afternoon in support of the bill under consideration by the committee. This bill is recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy after careful and long study. First, it had long study by a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. We all know of his diligence and the great attention and study that he gives to matters pertaining to our national defense and our atomic energy program. So the bill comes before the House well recommended and after careful and complete study.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I would like to speak especially of three projects we have added to the bill after receiving initial recommendations from the Atomic Energy Commission. I would like to make clear that while these items did not come to the committee in direct requests this year from the Commission, they are endorsed by the Commission. The Commission certainly would not oppose them because all of them have high priority within the Commission's division on research. The Commission, in my humble opinion, would be very happy to have the Congress act favorably on the items which I will mention.

Project 61–f–8 authorizes $5,600,000 for construction of a materials research laboratory at the University of Illinois. One of the roadblocks in the atomic energy program to date has been the difficulties with materials. Special new alloys are needed, capable of withstanding radiation, to meet special requirements in new atomic energy machines and equipment. Some of this work has been going on at the University of Illinois, which has now agreed to make available, on a long-term basis, valuable land on the campus, centrally located with respect to the participating departments. Scientists and engineers from several departments at the university would be able to participate, after construction of this new laboratory, in theoretical and experimental research of the following kinds: Solid state physics, theoretical studies, diffusion effects, solid state chemistry, magnetic resonance studies, theory of alloys, physical metallurgy, fundamental diffusion studies, and ceramics and refractories.

With this laboratory, the output of doctors of philosophy in this field would double within 5 or 10 years, from about 18 to about 36 annually, thus increasing the pool of qualified scientists in this critical area.

I might say this is one of our weak points, in the production or the lack of production of qualified people in these particular areas.

Project 61–f–9, also added by the Joint Committee, authorizes $2,200,000 for construction of a radiation laboratory at the University of Notre Dame. The radiation project at the University of Notre Dame is the largest university program primarily devoted to this work in the United States, and probably in the world.

In order to carry out this research, use is made of a 2-million-electron-volt Van de Graaff electrical generator, 2 cobalt 60 irradiators consisting of 1,200 curies each, X-ray equipment, special research spectrometers, and many pieces of scientific and electronic equipment. The present facilities made available by the university consist of 12,000 square feet of insufficient, inadequate floor space, mainly in the basement of the old chemistry building. The new laboratories would provide adequate effective facilities for the present program and allow a modest expansion of the project to make possible some additional needed research on radiation effects. The proposed building would contain radiation source and high intensity laboratories, research laboratories, and offices, shops, and supply and storage rooms.

Both of these projects were requested by the AEC Division of Research but were eliminated during the budget process. In the opinion of the Joint Committee, construction of these two laboratories, with the resulting increased effort, would help advance progress in the fields of materials and radiation effects, two critically important areas in our atomic energy program.

These two facilities would be constructed on university-owned land, but the Joint Committee believes that the Government's investment could and should be adequately protected by appropriate long-term lease arrangements, as has been done by the Atomic Energy Commission on other occasions.

Project 61–h–1 provides $5 million for installations for support of biomedical research in atomic energy. This program is under the direction of the AEC's Division of Biology and Medicine, and the facilities are used to explore biological and medical effects of radiation, including those from radioactive fallout. In 1957 and again in 1959 the Joint Committee held detailed hearings on the nature of radioactive fallout and its effect on man. One of the major conclusions of our committee hearings was that an increased research effort was needed. This year the AEC requested $4 million for new construction projects in the biomedical research program, and the Joint Committee has recommended increasing this by $1 million to a new total of $5 million.

In view of the concern of the public over fallout and radiation in the new atomic age, I urge all Members of the House to support this increase, as recommended by our committee.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the Joint Committee has added two projects and increased the amount for one other so as to provide what we believe to be a balanced basic research program in three critically important areas. Our recommendations are based upon thorough hearings, both on this bill and in previous years.

I urge all Members of the House to support the bill in the form recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I would like at this time to thank the gentleman for what he said about me. I want to say that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] has done one of the most devoted jobs of running the Research Committee of any individual who has ever served on the committee. He has brought to the House many things by extensive hearings, and he has done a wonderful job all through the years.

So has my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. He has rendered outstanding service to the committee, present most of the time. To a large degree House Members have spent many hours of service trying to carry out this program and solve our problems. There is not a Member on the House side of the committee that has not worked hard in the committees and attended the hearings.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. May I say that one of the greatest awards in my career in the House of Representatives has been the pleasure I have had in serving almost the entire time on committees with the gentleman from North Carolina: The old Military Affairs Committee, the House Armed Services Committee, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have never been associated with a more wonderful person.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the remarks which have been made directed toward my good friend and able colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, CARL DURHAM. I have now served with him for 2 years on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and over 10 years on the Armed Services Committee, as my father did before me. We all have a deep affection and respect for CARL DURHAM. We will all miss him when he retires this year. On behalf of myself and others who have a fond affection for him, we wish him a long and prosperous life.

Mr. Chairman, we present to the House today for its consideration H.R. 11713, a bill authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1961. The authorizations contained in section 101 total $211,476,000, and with one exception which I shall discuss later, represent an effort which will permit the United States to maintain its lead in the nuclear field.

The advent of atomic energy in the forties brought with it not only speculation of the outgrowth of this field, but it was commonly accepted that its frontiers were unlimited and its answers to the problems of the day were almost all encompassing. The last decade and, more particularly, the last few years indictated the fallacy of many overenthusiastic laymen, for instance, that electric power could be produced with extremely low cost and that desire alone could bring to fruition boundless solutions.

Today the approach to the problem is more realistic, heads have come down out of the clouds and the practical avenues in this field are more closely followed and more generally understood. This evaluation has not in any way limited the frontiers which are sought; it is only that scientific knowledge and understanding have replaced fiction with fact.

The previous speakers have explained the bill in detail involving nuclear materials, atomic weapons, reactor development, physical research, and those projects having to do with biology and medicine. I believe, as does the committee, that all of these fields must be aggressively pursued to not only preserve the prestige involved in being the leading nuclear power in the world today, but also because of their vital significance in regard to the security of our Nation, and also because of the contributions the peaceful uses of atomic energy can make to the well-being of our people in so many ways.

For the most part this bill was recommended to the committee by the Atomic Energy Commission. There was one item added that I would like to discuss that has also been approved by the AEC.

When Admiral Dufek returned from his great Polar expedition to the Antarctic sometime ago, he explained with graphic illustrations, both orally and by pictures, many of the problems he encountered there. He told of the great cost of fuel oil being delivered there. He indicated that 80 percent of all transportation involved in the project was merely to get oil delivered from its source to its destination. The cost of this fuel ranged up to $10 a gallon compared to 12 to 15 cents in the States. In the last 3 years, equipment valued at almost $11 million had been lost in providing logistics for these bases. Most important of all, 17 lives have been lost. It seemed to me that these remote areas would be ideal for small nuclear reactors. It would save lives, it would save money, and add to the prestige of our Nation. I understand that these reactors will recover their costs in approximately 3 years. It is for these reasons that I have advocated these reactors for the Antarctic and why I support their inclusion in the bill before us.

It is my understanding that an amendment will be offered to authorize the full amount of $107 million for the Stanford accelerator. There was a difference in the committee as to the approach of this problem and the majority of the committee voted to include only $3 million under project 61–f–7 for design and engineering for a linear electron accelerator.

A strict interpretation of this language would preclude the design of buildings, site layout, specifications and drawings for accelerator housing, and such other detailed design and engineering required by the master plan, as well as securing bids. The committee report supplements the language of the bill to provide that all of these functions can be performed and that such is the intent of the committee. Hence one problem was clarified.

However, the Stanford scientists expressed further concern. The AEC had requested $4.2 million for appropriations this year and $107 million for authorization. The limiting authorization of $3 million meant that appropriations would be limited to that amount and, consequently, the construction of a general laboratory to house the design and engineering group and site preparation cannot be commenced.

In addition, the Stanford scientists believe that the limited action by the committee of authorizing only $3 million out of the $107 million requested creates such uncertainty that recruitment of top grade scientific personnel will present an acute problem. This is especially true in view of the fact that last year no action was taken on the request. Hence scientists who presently have tenure and

challenging positions elsewhere will not go to Stanford unless the situation is clarified and the uncertainty removed.

The matter of this accelerator is the only point at issue in this bill. The scientists in the Piore panel who studied this whole matter stated that it is "clearly our view, the Nation will err seriously if budgetary limitations should prevent the authorization of new accelerator construction. The panel wishes to express its concern about the delay which has been encountered in authorizing this machine to date."

I understand that an amendment will be offered to include the full amount of $107 million. I will support the amendment and recommend its adoption to the House.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentlemen from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my respects to the vice chairman of this committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, CARL DURHAM.

As a new member of this Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I have done my best to learn as much as possible about the subject. Certainly it is a vast and complex one. I have learned a great deal from my valued friend, CARL DURHAM and I have admired his stand on many problems and questions that have come before this committee. As he intimated in his first address, there have never been any political overtones to his judgment. He has taken a look at the facts as they have come before him and judged accordingly. As I say, it has been a pleasure to work with him.

The majority leader previously intimated that he might start a grassroots groundswell to return CARL DURHAM to Congress. Although I am on the Republican side of this House, I would be very happy to go down to Chapel Hill and, if such a movement could be started, participate in that, because I really believe that CARL DURHAM has contributed tremendously to the solution of the problems faced by the Atomic Energy Committee. It has not been an easy job, and I know of no one who has devoted his time more assiduously to it. I sincerely regret that the gentleman from North Carolina has seen fit to resign from Congress.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Forty-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 82]

Alexander	Blitch	Brown, Mo.
Alford	Boggs	Buckley
Allen	Bolling	Burdick
Andrews	Bonner	Burleson
Anfuso	Bow	Canfield
Ayres	Bowles	Carnahan
Bailey	Boykin	Celler
Barden	Brooks, Tex.	Chamberlain
Chelf	Kirwan	Reece, Tenn.
Clark	Kitchin	Rhodes, Ariz.
Coad	Lafore	Rivers, S.C.
Colmer	Landrum	Roberts
Cook	Lankford	Robison
Cooley	Lennon	Rogers, Colo.
Corbett	Loser	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Rooney
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	St. George
Dawson	McGovern	Scherer
Dent	Machrowicz	Schwengel
Dowdy	Magnuson	Scott
Evins	Mailliard	Shelley
Farbstein	Marshall	Sheppard
Flynt	Martin	Short
Fogarty	Meader	Spence
Forand	Merrow	Stratton
Friedel	Michel	Taylor
Garmatz	Miller, George P.	Teague, Tex.
Gavin	Miller, N.Y.	Teller
Gilbert	Mitchell	Thompson, La.
Grant	Monagan	Van Pelt
Hays	Montoya	Wainwright
Hébert	Moore	Walter
Hemphill	Morris, N. Mex.	Wampler
Hoffman, Mich.	Multer	Watts
Holland	O'Hara, Mich.	Weaver
Ikard	O'Neill	Wharton
Irwin	Pilcher	Winstead
Jackson	Pillion	Wolf
Kee	Powell	Young
Kelly	Rains	Zelenko
Kilburn		

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALBERT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11713, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 309 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, we have discussed what is in the atomic energy authorization bill. I am about to discuss something that is not in it, and that many of us desire to place in the bill. This has a lot to do with protons, neutrons, and electrons. I am going to talk a little bit about those as well as about what a linear electron accelerator is so that we can clearly have in mind what the issue before us later today will be. But before that, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] who has chosen not to return to the Congress. We are going to miss him just as his district will miss his representation in this body and just as the Nation will miss his wisdom and the effectiveness with which he has served it for so long.

Now, my colleagues, if you pick up this glass of water here and pour it out, you make a mess on the floor. But, if you took a glass this size and back in the beginning of time, as we know it, started to pour into that glass a single stream of atoms, kept it up until today, after all those millions of years this glass still would not be half full. We are dealing in this area with something that small—the basic building blocks of the universe. These atoms—hydrogen, uranium, helium, and all the rest are divided further into parts and particles—neutrons, electrons, protons, and many others. It is the knowledge basically of what is inside these minute particles of matter that leads us to the knowledge of the universe, how and why we live in it and the ways in which to make our world better. Basic research brought us much knowledge already. Basic research has discovered the existence of these neutrons, electrons, and protons; discovered how they are put together in the thing we call the atom; how there is a nucleus of protons and neutrons; how it is surrounded by a shell of electrons to make up the basic atom. It was many years ago that scientists first theoretically determined these facts. Then experimentally they developed machinery to check out the theories and in checking out the theories, they added greatly to the basic knowledge that they have today. In the early thirties, when I was on the University of California campus, an obscure physicist named Ernest Orlando Lawrence, in a little tin building on the campus there, was constructing a new kind of scientific machine; he called it a cyclotron. What the cyclotron did was to take one of these basic particles, the proton, accelerate it to very high velocity and smash it into an atom. When that collision occurred, wreckage was created, its impression was caught on a photographic plate, and analysis showed Dr. Lawrence many of the things which later earned him a Nobel Prize and many other honors. These experiments also produced the knowledge which enabled us to conclude World War II successfully and which since that time has enabled us to resist the overwhelming manpower of the Russians, because it gave us the secret of the atomic bomb.

In other words, the atomic bomb was discovered basically out of the knowledge gained of this piece of machinery and others like it. It lead to the creation and discovery of plutonium, a substance that had disappeared from the earth many million years ago. It gave us knowledge of uranium 235 and led to discovery of all the other transuranium elements. It is these discoveries that have enabled the United States to lead the world in science.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I make an observation at this point? I think it is only fair to do so in connection with the atomic bomb, to which the gentleman has referred. Both branches of the Congress made marked contributions because I can remember when Speaker RAYBURN asked former Speaker MARTIN and myself to meet him in his office one morning. I did not know who was going to be there. I heard a rumor, but I did not know about the Manhattan project, and what they put up to us was that the Congress had to pass about $1,800 million in the next 2 fiscal years to carry on and maintain a project without letting our enemies know. It had to be done in secret. It was a calculated risk. It might be $2 billion down the drain, but we knew that Hitler's government was doing it. They started the experiment.

We did not know how many experimental plants they had. It was a race against time. If they perfected it before we did, we could very well lose the war overnight. I think this body and the other body, but it emanated from this body and the other body carried through—the money to carry on was originally started by President Roosevelt out of blanket funds appropriated to him, but he did not have enough money. We had to appropriate that money, and the American people are indebted to the Congress for what it did at that time.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman is correct. Every man who took part in it is to be congratulated. Today this Congress is going to have an opportunity to make a decision that might mean an equal amount to the United States of America, on this accelerator we are here talking about.

We have in this country, and they have now in U.S.S.R., machines known as cyclotrons and synchrotrons, and other great atomic smashers, which accelerate protons, as I have described, and smash them into an atomic target. When you are dealing with protons you are dealing with a particle that is 1,800 times greater in mass than electrons. When you use protons as bullets you get a lot of wreckage along with the information and data on subatomic particles that are keys to the inner secrets of the universe. In this linear accelerator we seek to accelerate the electron and use it as a bullet. Its mass is so much less than the proton that wreckage will be markedly reduced and a more discriminate and readable impression upon a photographic plate produced.

It, the linear accelerator, is the only type of scientific tool that will enable us to get into the areas of physics that no other nation is today penetrating. The construction and operation of this piece of machinery will guarantee the United States of America leadership in basic physics and leadership in basic sciences for at least a decade to come.

You might ask, why can we not accelerate these electrons in the atom smashers we have already spent a lot of money for, and get the job done right away? The reason is, if you attempt to accelerate an electron in a circular machine, it commences to lose energy by radiation instead of retaining energy by acceleration. As a consequence you have to accelerate in a straight line to achieve the required energies.

The linear acelerator is essentially a copper tube 2 miles long. I have here a section of the copper tube. It is about 3.5 inches in diameter. About every 1.5 inches, within this section of copper tube 2 miles long, there is a baffle with a small hole in the center. That is the hole through which the electrons pass as they accelerate.

Where do these electrons come from? You all have a television set in your home. Inside the television tube is an electron tube which causes the picture to show up. You have one of these at the beginning of the linear accelerator.

How do you accelerate? You accelerate the electrons in a very simple way. Actually, what you do is to take one of the parts out of a radar set, the klystron tube which creates very high energy, very short radio waves. These very short radio waves from the klystron tube are brought into the copper tube and bent in so they travel down through the baffle holes in the middle of the tube. Those waves act about like the situation at Waikiki Beach with the surfboards riding the waves. What happens is that the electrons ride along these high energy waves in similar fashion and are accelerated in velocity.

These waves come in from klystrons spaced about every 40 feet along the 2 miles. They enable acceleration to tremendous velocities. In accordance with Einstein's theory, as velocity increases mass increases. The mass of these electrons is increased approximately 100 times by the acceleration by the time they hit the target at the end of the tube. They are then about one one-hundred-and-eightieth the size of the proton. With that mass they are manageable. They can be aimed at a target. The resulting collisions give us information we have never had before. The linear accelerator will fill up the barrel of basic knowledge out of which our practical developments come. Interestingly enough, the majority of the committee only wants to delay this project until better cost estimates are made. But this piece of science machinery that can keep the United States ahead for decades is there, the cost is known, plus or minus 5 percent, and there is no good reason why we should not get on with it today. There is no good reason why we should not authorize the project in full rather than the $3 million for the study that the bill provides. Delay will cost us millions of dollars more in the end. Full authorization now will only raise from $3 million to $4 million the actual amount expended this year. Is that the something the majority is worried about when they say the costs have not been studied enough? We ought to authorize this in full.

That is what the President has asked for. He asked for it for a year ago and he asks for it now. A committee of the finest scientists of the country has again and again urged that we get going with the research tool, because it fills out our science effort in the field of basic physics. Today that effort is akin to a wheel with one side flat, a flat tire. It is not round. So, we are not going along as fast and as smoothly as we should. This tool will round out the wheel of high energy physics and make us able to go swiftly and smoothly down the road of basic knowledge.

There is posed here not whether we should spend this money but whether we can afford not to spend it, and we cannot afford not to spend it in today's competitive world. Neither can we afford to go about this job inadequately. As a nation we can afford to go about it properly, to do it right and we owe it to ourselves to so proceed. There is a lot of money involved here, we might as well do the job right, and get the most for our dollars.

We need the full authorization now, at this time, so that we can get a scientific team together. That is prerequisite to doing this job. It so happens that at Stanford University there is the nucleus of a team that developed the klystron tube that I talked about. That is the only reason the project happens to be located there. But, there are not enough of these people to do this design and engineering job as it should be done. We need to pull in additional members of this team, about double the size, from around 30 to around 60, so that it can be done perfectly the first time, so that it can be done with the highest quality. You simply cannot attract that quality people and bring the team together without a full authorization. They will not uproot themselves on the basis of a mere 1 year design study. Some people say, "Well, if we do not authorize it, we will only delay it 6 or 8 months." Well, that is true, but I am as much more worried about the quality of the scientific tool, the adequate design of this fine and expensive piece of machinery as I am in the time delay. For that reason it is inconceivable that this Congress will not act expeditiously to get the scientific team together.

It faces us with a great decision on our country's scientific future. The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK, spoke about a momentous decision that this Congress was faced with before on the Manhattan project. Congress then rose to its responsibility. Here again we have today the responsibility of either denying or acquiring for the Nation a piece of science machinery that is fundamental to our entire scientific effort. Just as with the Manhattan project, if we can persuade you gentlemen, when the amendment today is offered, to authorize this fully, I can assure you that as the years go by you will look back and say, "That was a fine thing I did that day in May 1960, because out of what I did has come to our Nation advancement that was far beyond anything we have ever known before."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I wonder if the gentleman would tell the committee what it would mean in the way of increased cost by simply authorizing an appropriation of $3 million for design and study this year and neglecting to authorize the project in its entirety?

Mr. HOSMER. If we authorize the project in its entirety, we will start getting the building built, and we will require about $4 million cash instead of $3 million cash this year. If we fail to authorize it this year and delay for 1 year, we will run into the cost escalation factors which will more than overcome any money that might be saved otherwise. In other words, if the project costs $107.2 million if it is started now, if we delay a year it will cost almost another 4 million or 5 million. That is on the bare basis of the cost escalation. It will inevitably go up. So, if you want to buy it now and buy it right and buy a high quality of machinery at the lowest price, the time to go for it is now.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I hold in my hand here a letter signed by the Chairman of

the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. McCone, in which he points out that the failure of this Congress to authorize this project means that the cost eventually will rise from $107.2 million to $110 million, and from a time factor or standpoint, instead of spending 6 years to construct, it is going to take 6½ to 6¾ years, and thus the valuable experience that we need will be delayed and the construction will cost more.

Mr. HOSMER. Not only do we need it, but this is the kind of thing that scientific people all over the world, on this side of the Iron Curtain and the other side of the Iron Curtain, are excited about. They know that this is one of the boldest projects, one of the most profitable areas, of research, one of the greatest research tools that man will ever have.

And they can see, if this Congress authorizes this to be done today, the firmness and the determination of the leadership of the United States. I ask my colleagues to live up to the worthy reputation of this body and do what is best for our country and our people. When you have the opportunity to take part in the advancement of this great scientific effort by your vote on the amendment, I ask that you cast aside the doubts that you may have and, with our own scientific people, boldly move ahead, to give them and to give the United States what is needed to insure our scientific leadership.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'NEILL). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Will the gentleman yield to me at this time?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman has made a very fine technical discourse, but I believe that the House should know, from all the evidence and all the information we have before us, that the request is for $4,200,000. They only need that much.

Mr. HOSMER. The bill only authorizes $3 million.

Mr. DURHAM. That is all they were requesting. I think this is a little bit of a departure from the policy of the Congress. We have heretofore rather hesitated to build buildings on university campuses, without Government control, without building on land that we own in this country. This project I think is so large that I, as an individual, want to know all of the details. I feel that we have very little information.

Mr. HOSMER. I just want to say to the gentleman that the issue here is not nit-picking about location, it is not quibbling about cost, it is not sending this back, as has been done for 2 years now, to restudy it to death. The issue here is whether this Congress is going to act decisively and give this Nation the machinery that it needs to project itself forward in science and all that is allied with science. There can be legislative lags and authorizational gaps and congressional defaults which are just as dangerous to this country as those occurring anywhere else. I feel that unless we move forward on this project today we may find ourselves guilty of that kind of charges.

Mr. DURHAM. I believe the Commission testified that they can make progress under what is authorized by the committee; is not that correct?

Mr. HOSMER. Of course they can make progress. You can make progress with a dime, but if you have a dollar you can get there. That is what we are asking to be done here.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I should like to refer to this letter received from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission in which he says this:

> The earlier it can be completed—

He is referring to the Stanford accelerator—

> The earlier it can be completed and placed into operation the sooner will its contributions be realized and the greater will be our assurance of continued U.S. leadership in this important scientific field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Hr. HOSMER] has again expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's statement is a fine one. It was very theoretical, but it was a good statement on this subject, which is technical. We have this Midwest group of universities; there are about 12 of them, and they have still not come up with some of the answers involved in this matter. Those universities are in Indiana, Illinois, and elsewhere in the Midwest. It is a large group of universities, which have very fine technical personnel. My position in this is that until these theoretical physicists come in here and tell the Congress that this is feasible, that this can be done within our cost estimates, we had better follow the course we are suggesting.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I think the record will show that there was unanimous agreement among the scientists that this linear accelerator is feasible and it is basically necessary. The gentleman is referring to the Mura project, which is not an electron accelerator but a proton accelerator, an entirely different piece of machinery, about which some question was raised; but there is no question about the feasibility of the electron accelerator nor is there any question but that it opens up a new horizon for the scientist and unlocks a completely new door to basic knowledge, a door to which no other country is going to have access.

Mr. DURHAM. But we had not agreed on the construction cost of it.

Mr. HOSMER. The Atomic Energy Commission has studied it and got it down as close as anybody can get it, $107 million.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. It has been my pleasure for the past 4 years to be associated with him as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. In all of that association I have never known him to be anything but constructive and not in the least political. In my opinion, this Congress is losing a true southern gentleman. We all wish him well.

I should like to address my remarks entirely to the amendment which will be presented by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] to fully authorize a linear electron accelerator.

The question to be decided here today is this: Is the United States of America seriously interested in scientific advancement or do we intend to just talk about it? The scientific prestige of this Nation is at stake.

The entire scientific community of the country has endorsed construction of the Stanford linear electron accelerator. It has told us that present-day accelerators have been immensely useful in rolling back the frontiers of scientific knowledge; that these accelerators—or atom smashers, to use laymen's terms—can do much more in the future. But they also tell us that the newest frontier requires research in the acceleration of light particles or electrons. Present-day machines are so limited by their principle that penetrating research into the very basis of the universe is impossible without the use of a linear-type accelerator. This is a new type machine which will be a tool of basic science, the foundation for applied science. It is not a duplication of any existing machine.

The linear accelerator principle has been developed at Stanford whose personnel is recognized throughout the world as the most qualified group to construct this proposed machine. Since 1946, 10 linear accelerators have been constructed at Stanford or under Stanford's direction. Other nations are using Stanford personnel or design in forging ahead in this important work.

This machine would be used by all of the Nation's scientists. It would belong to the Nation and would be located on land valued at $4 million, offered to the country without charge.

The question is not whether the Stanford accelerator should or should not be built. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has recommended authorization of $3 million for design studies. This is a clearcut indication of the committee's desire to make construction of the accelerator possible.

I quote from page 9 of the committee report:

> The Joint Committee recognizes that an accelerator of this type could make a valuable addition to our national high-energy physics program.

On page 21 of the report, Dr. John H. Williams, AEC Commissioner and former Director of the Division of Research, testifies as follows:

> The 10- to 20-billion electron-volt electrical linear accelerator proposed by Stanford should be the next major step in the high-energy physics program of the country. Construction and operation of this machine

would put in the hands of U.S. physicists a most necessary tool, if we are to achieve maximum scientific progress.

The only question, therefore, is whether it should be fully authorized now or only partially authorized to the extent of $3 million. The appropriation for fiscal year 1961 will hardly be changed by full authorization. In fact, it will be increased by only $1,200,000. The only question, I repeat, is whether the project should be authorized partially or in full.

There are compelling reasons why the accelerator should be authorized in full at this session of Congress.

First, partial authorization will not make it possible to obtain the services of prominent personnel to design the accelerator, because such people would have serious misgivings about permanent employment.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are talking about a machine which costs $107 million. We cannot afford to have less than the best to design it. If we are forced to accept less than the best, we will get an inferior machine; it will cost more, and its completion will be delayed at a time when this Nation is in a desperate race to answer the unanswered in scientific research.

Here is what scientific advisers had to say about partial authorization in the committee hearings:

Dr. E. L. Ginzton, director of the Hansen Microwave Laboratory at Stanford, said:

I think the whole question before us and before the whole world is whether this country intends to or does not intend to build such an accelerator. If it is partially authorized, there will be an open question before everybody. It means we will not be able to obtain the services of prominent people who will have serious misgivings about permanent employment. As a result, the project will not be designed with the excellent staff we need. It will take longer to build and will cost more.

Dr. R. Rollefson, director, Midwestern Universities Research Association, has testified:

I agree with all the others who have testified here that it is important to authorize the whole amount. I think we of MURA have had considerable experience along this line, and we know how hard it is to attract and hold the best people when it is not sure what is going to happen.

Dr. Henry DeWolfe Smyth, of Princeton University, testified:

I feel very strongly, Mr. PRICE, that the full amount should be authorized at this time. I have had some experience in the past with situations where preliminary design was authorized or research was authorized on a project, and then there was a long delay before further authorization came through. This is extremely demoralizing. It makes it difficult to assemble a staff, and once the staff is assembled, and then there is delay in further authorization, the staff disappears and it becomes extremely difficult to reassemble the staff. In this case particularly, where the design is so fully worked out in the sense of depending on components that are already in use, and where, as I understand it, a machine could be built that would be very useful even without further development of the components, I think it would be very undesirable to give partial authorization.

In a letter dated April 13, 1960, to Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Mr. John F. Floberg, Acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said in part:

The Stanford linear accelerator project should be fully authorized for construction at this session of Congress.

* * * * *

We believe that the lack of full authorization of the project at this time may seriously hamper the recruitment of the additional top staff necessary for orderly progress of this project.

Within the past few weeks, in response to a specific query from the AEC, Stanford University has now stated:

We are experiencing some difficulty at the present time in keeping our present staff, the nucleus of the project, together, and there is serious danger that a number of the principal scientists on the staff will leave the university's employ because of the continuing uncertainty concerning full authorization of the project.

The number of physicists and engineers presently involved in Project Agreement No. 1 work is 27. We had planned to increase this to an average of 60 man-years during the first year of integrated development and construction activities. Under the existing circumstances we think we could recruit only five or six more physicists and engineers than we now have. Moreover, it is not likely that these new people will be of the excellence we had intended. Undoubtedly a partial authorization will not be attractive to scientists having tenure in other institutions or who otherwise require long-term commitments. As an example it would be impossible to recruit experienced high energy particle physicists who would be involved in more detailed calculations of shielding or study of other problems related to the utilization of the machine. This work is necessary for its design. Given full authorization this year we believe that we could staff to the extent and excellence that was originally contemplated.

My second reason for urging full authorization is that partial authorization will increase its costs. Present estimates provide for a 5 percent annual escalation of construction costs for each year that passes. The contingency fund also increases by 5 percent each year. Thus, for each year that final construction is delayed because of partial authorization, the cost will go up.

According to Blume & Associates, a consequence of delay in authorization for construction of the project will be an increase in the costs. Blume's estimates were predicated on the start of the construction program on July 1, 1960, with completion 6 years thereafter. Estimates of escalation were included for the second through sixth years at 5 percent a year. According to Blume:

If the project is not authorized and operations initiated so that this schedule can be followed, the cost estimates should be increased at the rate of 5 percent per year for escalation.

Thirdly, the national prestige requires full authorization at this time.

We are now the acknowledged leaders in high-energy nuclear physics research. The Soviet Union is putting tremendous effort into the construction and operation of linear accelerators. These machines have all been built on extraordinarily short construction schedules and with extremely rapid initial engineering and development. Clearly they emphasize the high-energy field as a matter of national prestige. For example, they have under design and site development a 50-billion-electron-volt machine of the circular, proton type which will probably be altered during construction to a capacity of 70 billion electron volts. They have three linear accelerators ready to start in 1960 or 1961 and another scheduled to be started at Kharkov.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I just want to correct the gentleman on that point. The Soviet Union will not have anything like this in operation.

Mr. GUBSER. They have three linear accelerators scheduled to go into operation in 1960 or 1961, with power up to 2 billion electron volts, and another to be constructed at Kharkov of 4 billion electron volts. This is considerably less than the Stanford accelerator.

Mr. PRICE. They have such a small machine that they are not even comparable in this area.

Mr. GUBSER. Granted—we are way ahead of them and the gentleman has clinched my point. But Russia is becoming active in the high-energy field.

Much has been made of the alleged fact that we lag behind the Soviet Union in scientific research. Here is a field where we excel them. Must we partially authorize the Stanford accelerator, delay a year, spend more money, and allow the Russians to catch up? The national prestige is at stake.

Fourth, this project is ready for full authorization now. Look at this stack of reports and cost estimates from reliable enginering firms. It has been thoroughly reviewed by the Atomic Energy Commission in addition to two engineering firms. The President's Scientific Advisory Committee has twice recommended it. A special National Science Foundation panel on high-energy physics has recommended it. The general advisory committee of the Atomic Energy Commission has also recommended it; and so has the President of the United States.

The costs of this project are estimated better than any other project which has ever been presented. They are estimated as exactly as they can ever be. Listen to the testimony of Dr. T. A. Welton of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Oak Ridge, during the hearings:

The proposal is remarkably free of technical difficulties and cost uncertainties. This is the result of the extensive experience with the present Stanford machine. * * * The independent cost estimate by William M. Brobeck & Associates is much more detailed than any ever before prepared prior to construction authorization. It fails to reveal any such gross optimism on the part of the Stanford group as it has become customary to expect. There seems to be no reasonable basis to doubt that the requested funds will allow completion of the planned machine, with highly successful operation. To summarize, the Stanford proposal is very much more free of technical problems than has been the case for any previous accelerator.

On page 9 of the committee report, the majority indicates as its sole reasons for partial rather than full authorization

the fact that it is not satisfied with the cost estimates because "Unforeseen additions relating to possible changes in cooling, shielding, ground loading, and so forth, should be more carefully reviewed before proceeding." This field of cooling, shielding, and ground loading is exactly the area where Stanford believes that it cannot recruit prominent personnel with less than full authorization. It therefore follows that cost estimates cannot be improved in the areas mentioned by the majority unless personnel is available. In fact, it is quite possible that without prominent personnel, the cost estimates will be less favorable. Let me repeat a previous quotation of Stanford University officials which substantiates the above view:

It would be impossible to recruit experienced high energy particle physicists who would be involved in more detailed calculations of shielding or study of other problems related to the utilization of the machine.

To quote the minority report from page 20 of the committee report:

Because the majority report states that "more design and engineering might result in better cost estimates," we believe it necessary to emphasize the thoroughness of the cost reviews already made. Volume 3, page XI–2, of the Blume report contains a table entitled "Comparison of project cost estimates—Stage 1 construction," setting forth columns of estimated costs at five different sites, and demonstrating that the Sand Hill site would have the lowest cost. Then, beginning at page XV–7, there commences a table entitled "Sand Hill site, stage 1 construction, project cost estimates," which sets out, for eight pages, a detailed cost breakdown and schedule, followed by a list of drawings and site location plans.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me repeat my points. The Nation needs this machine. If it is not built, we—

First, will not get the best personnel to design it;

Second, it will cost more;

Third, it will not be the best we can get; and

Fourth, we will suffer a serious blow to our national prestige.

This project is ready for full authorization. Its cost estimates have been made by experts. Full authorization will have practically no effect on the budget we are now considering, but it will have a maximum effect upon the quality of machine we will get, how much it will cost, and when we will get it.

We all worry about the great scientific competition afforded us by the Soviet Union. This is our chance to prove before the world that we too will fill the granary of knowledge for use by generations of the future. I urge adoption of the amendment to fully authorize the Stanford linear electron accelerator.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. I want to join with the gentleman on this question of authorization of this project. We have listened on this floor many times on the scientific race, and we have authorized many millions of dollars to encourage students in the universities. Here is a project, a machine that is absolutely essential in the further development of certain scientific knowledge. I think if the Congress fails to authorize it in this session we are going to set this development back for over a year.

I think you have made a wonderful contribution, to the discussion and I join you in it.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I cannot agree with the gentleman who has just made the statement to the gentleman who holds the floor, because I do not think that anyone on the Joint Committee opposes this project as such. The issue is not whether or not this is an essential tool, but the issue is whether or not we are quite ready, on the basis of cost estimates that we now have, to grant the full authorization, because our experiences have already proven that by careful study we have been able to adjust this program, and perhaps by further study we can make further adjustments that will guarantee its efficient use after it is completed.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question. I would like to read the conclusion of the report by John A. Blume & Associates:

Before final design is undertaken and before the final alinement is selected, a detailed site investigation is recommended. Such investigation should include detailed geological mapping, further investigation of ground water conditions, careful study of cut and fill slope stability, and definitive analysis of excavation and foundation problems. This work should include a comprehensive program of trenching, drilling, and material testing and investigation of possible elastic strain accumulation in the subject areas. This latter recommendation is amplified and explained in the text.

This is all we are asking. We commit ourselves to authorization, but we want a full investigation. What the committee is doing is exactly what the committee is doing with the 12 midwestern universities.

Mr. GUBSER. May I say to the gentleman that I can also quote from the Blume report:

If the project is not authorized and operation initiated so that this schedule—

The 6-year schedule—

can be followed, the cost estimate should be increased at the rate of 5 percent per year for installation.

I would like to say one more thing to the gentleman. The committee report states that the area in which better cost estimates are desired is in the area of shielding and cooling. Yet the testimony of experts tells us this is information that will develop during the course of construction. They tell us you can get better cost estimates and better construction if you have prominent people. They also state that with partial authorization you will not get the people who can give us the best shielding and cooling cost estimates.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. We have heard a lot about a more detailed study that is needed. I would like to comment that if we follow this type of philosophy, obstacles can be raised for every project in the Atomic Energy Commission program. If we do this what will happen to the other proposed accelerators, and also power reactors, the ANP project Project Rover? Project Pluto? Project Sherwood?

Final site study would not normally be done until after the project is authorized.

Site problems have been as thoroughly studied as could be expected at this stage of authorization.

Studies which have been more thorough than for any other similar project indicate no fundamental adverse site conditions.

Of course, more detailed site studies will be made, as in any project, as the projects proceed.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], chairman of the subcommittee, who knows more about this measure than anyone connected with the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we have heard some rather extensive statements on this matter, and I would like to recapitulate if I can and describe the situation. I do not intend to make a long speech. I intend to place my comments in detail in the RECORD for those who wish to read them later. It is late Friday afternoon, and a number of Members have expressed the desire to catch trains and planes home for speaking engagements to which they were previously committed. It has been necessary to curtail some of their plans because of the unanticipated carryover of this bill until today. This is through no fault of anyone, of course, because the defense bill took more time for debate yesterday than was expected.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Surely the gentleman does not expect us on the floor to pay more attention to the fact that somebody wants to catch a train and leave his duties in Washington than to pass on an important subject of this kind? The gentleman does not want us to go away with that sort of impression, does he?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman knows that the present speaker does not want anyone to go away with that impression, but there is such a thing as using a certain degree of consideration for your colleagues. It is frequently practiced on the floor of this House, that we adjourn over, for instance.

Mr. YOUNGER. Let us adjourn over until Monday, then.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Unfortunately, the gentleman now in the well of the House is not in charge of the program. The gentleman is following the leadership, as the gentleman on the other side of the aisle is, I am sure.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] made a very fine technical explanation of what an electron accelerator happens to be. There are various kinds of accelerators. I could spend a half hour telling you the kinds of accelerators there are.

The statement has been made by the gentleman who intends to introduce an amendment which will raise this bill $104 million that this accelerator is needed. Well, there is no quarrel on the part of the Members on the majority side that this is a desirable accelerator. The testimony before our committee established the fact that it is desirable, but there was also a great deal of testimony before our committee which, in the opinion of the majority, shows that the main work has not been done on this particular case.

Let me give you a few figures. In 1957, when this accelerator was first proposed it was supposed to cost $80 million. Then another estimate was made and it was supposed to cost $116 million. In 1959 the AEC estimated it would cost $105 million. Now, they hired a very distinguished group to make a study of it, Blume & Associates, engineers, and the Blume people came back and said it would cost $126 million. Then the AEC proposal presented to this committee amounted to $107 million.

Now, the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have not talked to you about some other things that go along with this $107 million. There is $18 million needed for research and development. There will be $20 million the first year for operating costs, and that is a total of $46 million that will be added to the $107 million, provided that is all that will be spent.

Now, we are building one large accelerator. That is located at the Argonne National Laboratory. The first estimate to come before us was $15 million. They came back and raised this figure to $27 million. Do you know what the figure is today? Forty-two million dollars, starting out with a $15 million estimate.

Now, we want to know what we are doing when we go into this program. Spending $107 million, that is the first estimate. Is the cost of this accelerator going to accelerate three times as the Argonne Laboratory did, from $15 million up to $42 million? Is it going to be $107 million? Is it going to be $321 million? Is it going up three times? That is what the majority of this committee is concerned about. That is why we are asking for some additional cost estimates on this. For instance, Blume & Associates asked for some additional work to be done, and their conclusions and recommendations, No. 2, state as follows:

> Before final design is undertaken and before the final alinement is selected, a detailed site investigation is recommended. Such investigation should include detailed geological mapping, further investigation of ground water conditions, careful study of cut and fill slope stability, and definitive analysis of excavation and foundation problems. This work should include a comprehensive program of trenching, drilling, and material testing and investigation of possible elastic strain accumulation in the subject areas. This latter recommendation is amplified and explained in the text.

Now, this job of preliminary work has not been done; it has been partly done. We do not know what they are going to come up with. In the first instance, they were going to put this accelerator in a tunnel in the ground, and the Joint Committee demurred at that last year. This was going to cost them a great deal of money. They went back and made a study and decided that they could build it above ground on a cut and fill basis, and they decided that that would save about $25 million by making a cut and fill operation in place of a tunnel through the earth.

We went into the matter of the cost of operation of this particular accelerator from the standpoint of electrical energy. In last year's hearings the AEC came before us and said they were going to buy electricity at a cost of 9.3 mills. We told them to go back and look at the situation again and study it. They came back this year with an estimate that they had now made arrangements through the Bureau of Reclamation, Trinity River Division, to obtain electricity at 4.6 mills. We saved $660,000 a year by that one point of delay.

This committee is in favor of scientific research. There is not another committee in the House over the years, the 14 years that this committee has been in existence, that has supported scientific research any more diligently and aggressively than this committee. The progress of the Atomic Energy program is evidence that this tremendous scientific effort has been amply supported by this committee. This committee intends to continue to support scientific research. At the present time we have upwards of $150 million invested in accelerators. They are not all this kind of accelerator; I do not want to mislead the House. But the free world at this time has, as far as we know, the largest electron accelerators in existence. As far as we know the Russians do not have one. They have plans for building one, it is true; but as far as we know they are not building one. So we are excelling in this field at the present time. There is no doubt we can go faster. You can go faster in any program if you want to put the money into it. It is a problem of how much money you want to put in at the present time. How do you want to space your expenditures? Do you want to develop a balanced program or an unbalanced program?

Maybe the majority of the committee are wrong in estimating that this is the right way to go about it, the balanced way to go about it. We are furnishing $3 million in this program for further design and engineering studies and to give them a few more months to bring back the information which this committee wants and which the Blume Associates said they should obtain before they started their operations.

I know my friends on my left are interested in this subject just as I am. But I do not yield to them any greater degree of interest in the advancement of science in this country, nor does the majority yield to them any greater degree of interest in science. We believe we are proceeding in an orderly way. We believe that the program we have laid before you is an orderly program.

The Bureau of the Budget has approved $293,876,000 for the atomic energy program. This bill authorizes $211,476,000. This is a reduction of $82,400,000 from the request of the AEC and the Bureau of the Budget. We believe that we are justified in making that reduction at this time in view of the overall expenditures of Government and in view of the overall expenditures in the atomic energy program and in view of our position of competition in the world in this particular line of high energy physics.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take any additional time at this time. I understand that an amendment will be offered to increase the amount of this bill by $104 million. The position of the majority in bringing this bill to your attention is that we are against that particular amendment. I ask that the Committee consider the arguments that have been made on both sides and vote their conscience on this matter.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I would not want to have this House go away with the impression that we have pinned any economy merit badges on our chest in this authorization bill by cutting out $107.2 million for this linear accelerator below what the President requested.

When that went out, $35 million went in for various other projects, projects that will actually require expenditures this year by way of appropriations much greater than the $4 million-plus on the linear accelerator even if we did make a full authorization of it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman had better consult his figures.

Mr. HOSMER. I have consulted my figures and I have confidence in them.

May I ask this question: In view of the unanimous testimony that a linear accelerator of this size and power is a basic tool necessary for the Nation's scientific advancement, does the gentleman feel that there is any question about eventually building that machine in this country?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has very clearly stated that the position of the majority is not against the building of this type of accelerator at the proper time, but the position of the majority on this item is as it has been on other items, to properly and carefully look at the preparatory work that has been done and to select the timing to initiate such a gigantic undertaking. We are furnishing $3 million for them to start on their design and engineering work. They have testified before the committee they can spend only $2.2 million in that field. We feel that by the time they have spent the $3 million and brought back to us the other items of information that we want—and the gentleman is aware I have touched on only

a few; I could go into the patent position of the klystron tube and a few other things that have to be ironed out—when they bring that information back, I am sure this committee will exercise its good judgment and come back to this House with a timely item in its authorization bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11713, the AEC authorization bill for the fiscal year 1961 program which has been recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislation I sat through hearings on March 8, 10, 11, and April 5, 6, and 7, in which we explored every item in the bill very carefully. Vice Chairman DURHAM has given you a description of the scope of the authorization bill and the projects which the Joint Committee has added or modified.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, has described particularly those research projects which the Joint Committee added to the bill.

I would like to endorse what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has stated and to support all of the projects added and modified by the Joint Committee.

I would particularly call your attention to the Antarctic atomic power projects—project 61–d–10, page 3, lines 19 and 20—added by the Joint Committee as being a very necessary and desirable project. From the standpoint of economy alone they will pay for themselves after a few—2 to 5—years of operation in comparison with conventional fuel supplies. In addition they will save many lives which would otherwise be lost in transporting fuel for conventional power units. Over the last 2 or 3 years 17 planes have been wrecked, with a total of 17 lives lost and $10½ million in property damage. Moreover, having atomic powerplants at our Antarctic bases will undoubtedly enhance the prestige of the United States with the international scientific community which is represented by numerous expeditions in this important area.

Another project I would like to discuss is project 61–h–1, installation for support of biomedical research in atomic energy, $5 million.

This project covers miscellaneous additional facilities for the conduct of research in the field of radiation effects on biological systems, including the effects of radiation from radioactive fallout.

Included in this project are such items as a nuclear reactor to furnish bursts of radiation for the study of the effects of radiation on animals, radiobotany facilities to study genetic effects, animal quarters to study the effects of chronic radiation, radiobiological laboratory facilities, and modification of existing facilities in this field.

The Atomic Energy Commission requested $4 million for such facilities in its fiscal year 1961 authorization request. The Joint Committee increased this amount by $1 million, to a total of $5 million.

Last year the Commission requested $2 million for such facilities and the Joint Committee increased the request by $1 million, to a total of $3 million. The total $3 million authorized last year has been committed by the Commission for the support of work in this vital field.

The hearings held by our committee on the biological effects of radiation have brought forth the great need for additional data in this field. Solutions to the problems of radiation are absolutely dependent on the availability of additional experimental data on the biological effects of radiation.

The Joint Committee's Special Radiation Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has scheduled additional hearings on this subject. These hearings are scheduled to start on May 24 and will extend through the first week in June. In these hearings we intend to get the information on our work in the field of radiation standards to clarify some of the confusion and misunderstanding by the public and the scientific community concerning the basis and use of radiation standards.

POWER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

This authorizes a total of $40 million for the atomic power demonstration program. Of this amount, $15 million is authorized for research and development assistance for unsolicited proposals for construction of private power reactors. The Southern California Edison Co. recently announced it is negotiating with Westinghouse for a large 360,000-kilowatt plant, which could be assisted under this authorization. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is also interested in a large plant. The other $25 million is for an organic moderated prototype, or can be used for other projects under certain conditions.

It should be noted that the AEC did not request authorization of additional atomic power projects for fiscal 1961. There were one or two projects which the Joint Committee might have added—such as a $60 million natural uranium heavy water prototype. However, we decided to watch the development of technology from reactor experiments and research and development before taking this step.

Finally, I would like to mention the authorization of $3 million for further design and engineering for the Stanford linear accelerator. It is believed this is an adequate amount to make progress in the project, while at the same time firming up plans and estimates prior to authorization of construction. I expect to discuss this project at greater length later.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill is a good one, and deserves our support.

STANFORD ACCELERATOR PROJECT

I would like to mention the reasons the Joint Committee provided $3 million for further design and engineering on the Stanford accelerator project. I want to make it clear at the outset that the Joint Committee, and particularly its majority, is in favor of continuing design, engineering, and development of this project, and doing everything necessary—short of authorizing construction—to enable the project to go ahead after January 1961, providing proper justification of cost estimates, personnel, and program planning.

This Stanford accelerator project has had a rather peculiar history. When Stanford originally made its proposal to the Commission several years ago for this accelerator project, the cost estimate was $79 million. This, of course, is a lot of money. However, when the project was submitted to the Congress and the Joint Committee in May of 1959 the cost estimate was $105 million. Although the project was submitted too late in 1959 to be considered in conjunction with the AEC authorization bill we were admonished that we should consider the project thoroughly and authorize it if possible.

The Joint Committee did hold special hearings on the project. It became apparent that the cost situation did require some looking into. However, we were, as I say, requested to go ahead and authorize the project. Two examples, however, of questions on the cost may serve to indicate some of the things that troubled us at that time.

One of them was the cost of the 2-mile tunnel for the accelerator. We inquired whether the problem of stable ground conditions had been considered and whether enough attention had been given to special problems of tunneling. We were assured that they had been. However, AEC Chairman McCone, last fall, did institute a further engineering study that came up with the fact that the costs of the tunnel would substantially increase the cost of the project by several millions of dollars. In total the estimate, instead of being $105 million, would have been $126,700,000.

Another question that we raised last year concerned the cost of electric power needed for the operation of the accelerator. The estimate used by the AEC and its contractors was based on obtaining power at a rate of 9 or 10 mills from the private power company serving that general area. Chairman Anderson raised the question of whether or not it would be possible to obtain cheaper power from some other source since the amounts required for the operation of the accelerator were rather large—some 50,000 electrical kilowatts capacity being required initially and 120,000 kilowatts ultimately. It turned out after substantial study over the recess that the AEC has now arranged to get power from the Department of Interior for the Stanford accelerator at about 4½ mills thereby halving the original estimated operating costs for the accelerator. The net cost savings run from $660,000 to $1,300,000 per year.

Each of these examples of caution by the Joint Committee has saved millions of dollars in construction and operating costs for the Stanford accelerator.

This year we followed the pattern of last year in terms of the request for the authorization of the Stanford accelerator.

Instead of the project being submitted as a part of the AEC authorization bill we were told that there were differences

of opinion within the executive branch that needed to be ironed out before it could be submitted. Therefore, the project was not submitted until shortly before the conclusion of our hearings on the AEC authorization bill. Nevertheless the Subcommittee on Legislation did conduct hearings on the project and after considerable deliberation decided not to authorize construction but did provide $3 million to proceed with further design and engineering on the project. There are several reasons for this position taken by the Joint Committee with respect to the project.

It should be pointed out that the $107 million estimate is not the whole story. There is additional development work and other activities in conjunction with the accelerator which will cost approximately $46 million which the AEC has classified as "operating costs," which will also have to be incurred with the construction of the reactor. One of our Senate minority members suggested that perhaps this additional $46 million should be classified as construction costs rather than operating costs. In any event, this additional money will be required. This $107 million estimate, plus $46 million estimate, will also be increased by an additional $40–$50 million when, and if, the output of the accelerator is increased from 15 Bev to 45 Bev.

So as the project stands today, together with its acknowledged future increases in cost, it is already a $200 million project. If the experience we have had with other accelerator projects is followed, the ultimate cost of the project could go up another $100 million, since actual costs have generally doubled over the original estimates.

We believe that the cost estimates for this project have been improved as a result of further study by the Commission and its contractors over the recess. However, there are still certain aspects of the cost that would appear to require looking into.

As I mentioned, the cost estimate for the project, utilizing a tunnel for the accelerator, rose from $105 million to $126,700,000. As a result of this increase, presumably, it was determined that rather than utilizing a tunnel they would utilize the cut-and-fill method of construction with the accelerator housing lying on top of the land rather than in a tunnel. By this means, together with other cuts, the project estimate was pulled down from the $127 million estimate to $107 million.

However, with respect even to the cut-and-fill method, there may be some matters which should be further looked into. For example, only three test borings have been made for the particular site that is now recommended. It is recognized for the so-called cut-and-fill method, not as many test borings have to be made as for a tunnel. However, for a 2-mile cut-and-fill location it would seem that greater attention should be given to taking borings for the entire length of the acceleraor housing rather than at only one end of it as has been done.

Another question on the cost estimate involves the cost of the accelerator itself. In the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Legislation we inquired as to why the estimate for the accelerator proper rose from $23,789,000 to $27,635,000. The answer we received was quite vague and seemed to be more of a horseback guess.

Another reason for giving the AEC time to develop its cost estimates is to put the Stanford accelerator in proper relationship and balance to other high energy physics projects, as well as other basic research projects. The cost of high energy physics projects has increased tremendously in the last few years. The Joint Committee is in favor of proceeding with such projects but not at the expense of other desirable basic research projects. It should be noted that the various advisers to the President called attention to the need for insuring that low energy physics, for example, be encouraged and that the stress on high energy physics should not be at the expense of low energy physics. The AEC General Advisory Panel stated in regard to the high energy physics projects:

> We note, however, that the magnitude of Federal expenditure for high energy physics is reaching such a high level that it is important to insure that progress in this field does not interfere with the building up and orderly growth of other areas of basic science.

In this year's AEC authorization bill the Joint Committee, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] has explained, has attempted to obtain a balance in basic research projects by adding projects on materials research and radiation to be carried on in private and State institutions. The Joint Committee has asked for a report from the Atomic Energy Commission on the high energy physics program which is due in January 1961, which, we hope, will cover the relationship and costs of these projects and other research fields.

Another aspect of the Stanford project, which is of some concern and we hope will receive attention during the recess is as to what the organizational arrangements will be for operating the project. The Joint Committee inquired into this last year and received only general answers. We were surprised this year to find that apparently no progress had been made in determining how the project was going to be run. It seems to me that we are entitled to know how a $105 to a $150 million project is going to be organized and administered.

Lastly, there were some problems relating to patents and conflicts of interest which were looked into during the recess. It appears that the patent problem has been largely taken care of. Whether or not the conflicts of interest problem has been adequately handled remains to be seen.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that the Joint Committee inquired of the AEC as to whether or not the $3 million provided for the Stanford accelerator was adequate to make progress on the project. The letter from the Acting Chairman of the AEC confirmed that progress would be made. This is contained on pages 10–11 of the committee report on the bill, as follows:

> It is the Commission's view that the amount of $3 million for design and engineering together with the operating funds for continued development work is adequate for the Atomic Energy Commission and Stanford to make progress on the project.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I was greatly impressed a while ago when the majority leader told how this Congress appropriated $1,600 million for the Manhattan project without any quibbling or any information at all in order to achieve something that was necessary for the protection of this country. Here we are, even granting all of the figures given by the opponents, quibbling over a question of a few million dollars on a project that they say must be built, but they want it built in the future. I wish this Congress could rise to the heights that the Congress did when they were appealed to on the Manhattan project and go ahead and authorize this project which they all say is going to be built anyway.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 101. PLANT OR FACILITY ACQUISITION OR CONSTRUCTION.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with the provisions of section 261a.(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the sum of $211,476,000 for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion as follows:

(a) SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS.—

Project 61–a–1, modifications to production and supporting installations, $10,000,000.

Project 61–a–2, billet production plant, $1,800,000.

Project 61–a–3, heat treatment and inspection modifications, Fernald, Ohio, $2,500,000.

Project 61–a–4, development laboratory building, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $766,000.

Project 61–a–5, plutonium reclamation plant, Hanford, Washington, $2,900,000.

Project 61–a–6, moderator purification improvements, Savannah River, South Carolina, $2,500,000.

(b) ATOMIC WEAPONS.—

Project 61–b–1, weapons production, development, and test installations, $10,000,000.

Project 61–b–2, high-velocity test track, Sandia Base, New Mexico, $2,100,000.

Project 61–b–3, special metals fabrication plant, $3,000,000.

(c, ATOMIC WEAPONS.—

Project 61–c–1, contaminated waste plant, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $2,000,000.

(d) REACTOR DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 61–d–1, additions and modifications to Chemical Engineering Building, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, $2,000,000.

Project 61–d–2, special purpose test installation addition, Santa Susana, California, $1,200,000.

Project 61–d–3, technical space for SPERT, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, $500,000.

Project 61–d–4, critical building, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $600,000.

Project 61–d–5, fast reactor core test installation, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $6,900,000.

Project 61–d–6, plutonium fuel service and development building, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico, $600,000.

Project 61–d–7, test installation for Project Rover, $20,000,000.

Project 61–d–8, test installation for Project Pluto, $15,000,000.

Project 61–d–9, advanced test reactor, $24,000,000.

Project 61–d–10, power reactor plants for the Antarctic, $13,000,000.

(e) REACTOR DEVELOPMENT.—

Project 61–e–1, additions and modifications, MTR-ETR area, National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho, $800,000.

Project 61–e–2, site utilities, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $1,250,000.

Project 61–e–3, quarters for visiting scientists, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $550,000.

(f) PHYSICAL RESEARCH.—

Project 61–f–1, bubble chamber house, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $1,660,000.

Project 61–f–2, Princeton-Pennsylvania accelerator addition, Princeton, New Jersey, $10,820,000.

Project 61–f–3, accelerator and reactor additions and modifications, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $1,085,000.

Project 61–f–4, high flux isotope reactor, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, $12,000,000.

Project 61–f–5, accelerator improvements, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $500,000.

Project 61–f–6, major bevatron improvements, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $9,600,000.

Project 61–f–7, design and engineering, linear electron accelerator, $3,000,000.

Project 61–f–8, materials research laboratory, University of Illinois. $5,600,000.

Project 61–f–9, radiation laboratory, University of Notre Dame, $2,200,000.

(g) PHYSICAL RESEARCH.—

Project 61–g–1, metallurgy building extension, Brookhaven National Laboratory, New York, $655,000.

Project 61–g–2, addition to cyclotron building, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, California, $500,000.

(h) BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE.—

Project 61–h–1, installations for support of biomedical research in atomic energy, $5,000,000.

(i) COMMUNITY.—

Project 61–i–1, real estate development, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $435,000.

Project 61–i–2, elementary school addition, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $145,000.

Project 61–i–3, steam transmission line, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $135,000.

(j) GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS.—$34,175,000.

SEC. 102. LIMITATIONS.—(a) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (a), (b), (d), (f), and (h), only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 25 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(b) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (c), (e), (g), and (i), only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 10 per centum the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(c) The Commission is authorized to start a project under subsection 101(j) only if it is in accordance with the following:

1. For community operations, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be $100,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be $10,000.

2. For all other programs, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be $500,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such a project shall be $100,000.

3. The total cost of all projects undertaken under subsection 101(j) shall not exceed the estimated cost set forth in that subsection by more than 10 per centum.

SEC. 103. ADVANCE PLANNING AND DESIGN.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds for advance planning, construction design, and architectural services, in connection with projects which are not otherwise authorized by law, and the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes.

SEC. 104. RESTORATION OR REPLACEMENT.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds necessary to restore or to replace plants or facilities destroyed or otherwise seriously damaged, and the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes.

SEC. 105. CURRENTLY AVAILABLE FUNDS.—In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission by section 101 of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission to accomplish the purposes of this Act such sums of money as may be currently available to the Atomic Energy Commission.

SEC. 106. SUBSTITUTIONS.—Funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to start any other new project for which an estimate was not included in this Act if it be a substitute for a project or portion of a project authorized in subsections 101(a), (b), and (c) and the estimated cost thereof is within the limit of cost of the project for which substitution is to be made, and the Commission certifies that—

(a) the project is essential to the common defense and security;

(b) the new project is required by changes in weapon characteristics or weapon logistic operations; and

(c) it is unable to enter into a contract with any person, including a licensee, on terms satisfactory to the Commission to furnish from a privately owned plant or facility the product or services to be provided in the new project.

SEC. 107. AMENDMENT OF PRIOR YEAR PROJECTS.—(a) Section 101(d) of Public Law 84–506, as amended, is further amended by striking therefrom "Project 57–d–1, high energy accelerator, $27,000,000" and substituting therefor "Project 57–d–1, zero gradient synchrotron, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois, $42,000,000."

(b) Public Law 86–50 is amended by striking out the figure "$5,000,000" for project 60–e–12, alterations to Shippingport reactor facilities, and substituting therefor the figure "$9,000,000".

SEC. 108. PROJECT RESCISSIONS.—(a) Public Law 86–50 is amended by rescinding therefrom authorization for a project, except for funds heretofore obligated, as follows:

Project 60–c–2, special processing plant, phase II, Mound Laboratory, Ohio, $3,800,000.

(b) Public Law 85–590, as amended, is further amended by rescinding therefrom authorization for projects, except for funds heretofore obligated, as follows:

Project 59–b–4, special processing plant, Mound Laboratory, Ohio, $2,000,000.

Project 59–c–8, lineal acceleration tester, Livermore, California, $390,000.

Project 59–g–3, gamma process development irradiator, $1,600,000.

(c) Public Law 85–162, as amended, is further amended by rescinding therefrom authorization for projects, except for funds heretofore obligated, as follows:

Project 58–b–5, additions to scrap plants, various sites, $1,500,000.

Project 58–c–2, weapons special component plant, $6,000,000.

(d) Public Law 84–506, as amended, is further amended by rescinding therefrom authorization for a project except for funds heretofore obligated, as follows:

Project 57–a–7, modifications to existing production facilities for increased efficiency and safety, Hanford, Washington, $3,000,000.

SEC. 109. COOPERATIVE POWER REACTOR DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—(a) Section 111 of Public Law 85–162, as amended, is further amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1960," in clause (3) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1961."

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission the sum of $40,000,000 to be available, in addition to the funds heretofore authorized, for carrying out the Commission's power reactor demonstration program in accordance with the terms and conditions provided in Sections 110 and 112 of Public Law 86–50. The maximum amount of the program authorization, specified in subsection 110(b) of Public Law 86–50, is increased by $45,000,000. In addition to the amount authorized under subsection 110(c) of Public Law 86–50, the Commission is authorized to use funds not to exceed $15,000,000 in the aggregate, to provide research and development assistance in support of unsolicited proposals from the utility industry to construct nuclear powerplants.

(c) Section 110 of Public Law 86–50 is amended by deleting the word "two" in the first sentence of subsection (d).

SEC. 110. COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM WITH CANADA.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, in accordance with the provisions of section 261(a)(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the sum of $5,000,000 for use in a cooperative program of research and development in connection with heavy water moderated nuclear powerplants to be conducted under the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, signed on the 15th day of June 1955, as now or hereafter modified.

SEC. 111. DESIGN AND ENGINEERING STUDIES.—The Commission is authorized within its discretion to proceed with design and engineering studies to include, but not be limited to, the following:

(a) Facilities for food irradiation;

(b) Power reactor of steam-cooled type.

The Commission may submit reports on studies under this section to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by April 1, 1961.

Mr. HOSMER (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER: On page 4, lines 19 and 20, strike out "Project 61–f–7, design and engineering, linear electron accelerator, $3,000,000." and insert "Project 61–f–7, linear electron accelerator, $107,200,000."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, we are at the point now where the issue is

drawn. It is drawn on a project that everybody agrees is a good one, a necessary one and one that has to be built—a project that will insure the scientific leadership of the United States. The only difference from the financial standpoint is whether we are going to spend $4 million on it this year or spend $3 million on it this year. But from the standpoint of getting a quality project and getting a topnotch machine that will pull together the scientific team that is needed to produce this, we are facing a much greater issue. We are facing an issue akin to that mentioned by the majority leader when he said that the Congress had risen to its duty in connection with the Manhattan project. We are also dealing with a much vaster issue because this particular machinery in the eyes of the scientific world is something that is incomparable from the standpoint of potential accomplishment; something that is incomparable from the standpoint of prestige of the country that undertakes it. So my colleagues for $1 million actual appropriations increase in authorization of the full project that this year would involve, you can buy that tremendous prestige; for the $1 million you can put that team of topnotch scientific experts together to do the job the way it should be done—the way that this United States of America ought to do a job. As a matter of fact, with that $1 million you will probably get $5 million or $10 million or $15 million in return because if you delay this thing, you are going to run into cost escalation factors that will exceed the $1 million many many times. This is a science issue—this is a science issue, my colleagues, and it is an issue of whether you are going to support the scientific community and support the Nation's scientific effort with this project or whether you are not. The Joint Atomic Committee contrary to the way some of the Members have talked today, when they issued their report on basic science in 1958, after listening to one Nobel Prize winner after another Nobel Prize winner, asked for and pleaded for and recommended that the expenditures in this basic science field for just this kind of research tools be doubled and trebled. And that is the issue today. Are we going to have this thing? Are we going to have the best? Are we going to keep our national scientific leadership?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman knows in order to eliminate some of the confusion concerning this project, the minority asked the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to clarify the position of the Commission, and I would like to read what the Chairman of the Commission had to say:

> If the project were authorized in this session of the Congress for design engineering only and was not fully authorized until June of 1961, it appears that the most serious effect will be the lack of ability to recruit certain additional key scientists whom Stanford considers are essential for the development and design of the accelerator and experimental facilities.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman. I hope every one of you can go home after this session is over and be able to say that his action today prevented a gap in U.S. science; that he would not permit this to lag by congressional default. There will be no lag and there will be no gap if action is taken favorably on this amendment today, and I plead with you to act favorably on the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman know of any outstanding nuclear physicist in this country who is opposed to beginning the construction of this project at the earliest possible date?

Mr. HOSMER. There is none such. There is none such and there is no scientific leadership in the world that does not today look to the Congress of the United States to find out whether or not this country lives up to its role of leadership by boldly moving ahead with this project or loses that leadership by inaction today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, as I said in my opening statement, there is no one on the committee who is opposed to this project. It is a question of opinion. I think it is based on sound evidence and sound judgment, that we obtain a detailed cost estimate on this project. When we look at the list of construction of accelerators: cosmotron, bevatron, ZGS, Argonne, and Harvard, we see we started out with an initial cost of $4 million for the cosmotron and it went to $13 million. The others also had increases. The total cost was $72,300,000 at the start, and now it is $124,400,000. We have been trying at all times, all through this program, to bring to this Congress and to the country whatever was necessary to do the job. But we have always tried to do it based on evidence and based on facts, so that we would not get ourselves in a position of spending, as I said this morning, like we did on the wind tunnels, when we wasted a lot of money, we pulled the thing together and said, "No, we are going to have some judgment and some good estimates."

Now we have handled a very scientific matter that came out of the old Military Affairs Committee about 1940 or 1941. It began in the old days with the Fermi reactor under Stagg Field at the University of Chicago out of which has come all of this scientific development that we are discussing today. The Congress, in my judgment, has provided funds for these theoretical and experimental physicists to work with when they were ready.

I have talked to physicists all over the country.

We have heard talk about budget-busting. We do not want to throw this thing wide open without knowledge and without facts. All we are asking you to do is to give it study. I am not opposed to the project. I have stated that dozens of times. I offered an amendment giving them $3 million when they said they were only going to ask for $2½ million. There will be no undue delay in this thing.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to authorize in full the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University.

In addition to the convincing arguments already made by my colleagues, I would like to emphasize two points:

First. This project has been thoroughly studied. The original proposal for this accelerator was made by Stanford University in 1957, after 4 years of serious study by the scientists and engineers at Stanford who had performed many experiments in this field and were working on similar machines of smaller scale. In 1958, a special National Science Foundation Panel on High Energy Physics reviewed and recommended the Stanford accelerator. Later, in 1958, the President convened a special panel of scientists consisting of members of the President's Science Advisory Committee and the AEC General Advisory Committee, and on November 16, 1958, this panel, after careful review of our entire high energy program as well as this project, recommended the Stanford accelerator as the next, and a necessary, step.

In May 1959, the President reviewed the previous studies and recommendations, decided that it was worthwhile, and accordingly the AEC requested congressional authorization.

In July and August 1959, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held detailed hearings, published as a 649-page document entitled "Stanford Linear Electron Accelerator," containing a multitude of technical details and data on the project.

But the Joint Committee decided, in 1959, that further study was needed. During the fall, the AEC conducted a thorough review, investigating all matters raised by the AEC and the Joint Committee. In March 1960, the AEC submitted a complete "Status Report" reprinted at pages 396–400 of the hearings this year entitled "AEC Authorizing Legislation, Fiscal Year 1961." The Status Report indicates that because of the thorough AEC review, all matters of possible conflicts of interest, power supply, site location, methods of construction, and cost estimates have been thoroughly studied and resolved.

With regard to cost estimates, I would like to quote from page 20 of the separate views in our minority report:

> Because the majority report states that "more design and engineering might result in better cost estimates," we believe it necessary to emphasize the thoroughness of the cost reviews already made. Volume 3, page XI–2 of the Blume report, contains a table entitled "Comparison of Project Cost Estimates—State 1 Construction," setting forth columns of estimated costs at five different sites, and demonstrating that the Sand Hill site would have the lowest cost. Then, beginning at page XV–7, there commences a table entitled "Sand Hill Site, Stage 1 Construction, Project Cost Estimates," which

sets out, for eight pages, a detailed cost breakdown and schedule, followed by a list of drawings and site location plans.

In January 1960 the special panel of scientists convened again and once more recommended the project in the following words:

In particular, this panel wishes to reaffirm its recommendation to start immediately the construction of the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University, and to express its concern about the delay which has been encountered in authorizing this machine to date.

In April of this year, the Joint Committee held further hearings and AEC Chairman McCone and Commissioner John H. Williams testified once more in strong support of the project.

Second. This accelerator will be able to perform new and important experiments. Scientists have testified before our committee on the advances in recent years in understanding the fundamental constitution of matter—the structure of molecules, atoms, protons, neutrons, electrons, and strange particles. The study of the atomic nucleus is important, has led to important national defense discoveries in the past, and has aroused the interest of scientists the world over. This knowledge can be effectively advanced only through the use of ultrahigh energy accelerators of diverse capabilities. Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Director of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, stated at page 77 of the 1959 hearings concerning the Stanford accelerator:

The unique potentiality of the proposed accelerator lies, however, in the possibilities it affords for structural studies of elementary particles.

During the hearings this year, I asked some questions, understandable to laymen, of Dr. John H. Williams as to the type of particles that would be sought in this machine:

Representative WESTLAND. There is not one fundamental particle that you are seeking?

Dr. WILLIAMS. No. There are over 30 that we have seen. The fundamental difference between what we can do with existing machines and the so-called Stanford accelerator is that all the existing machines that get up to this energy are proton machines. There is no electron machine with the characteristics of the Stanford accelerator available. In other words, we believe by building this so-called linear electron accelerator we will be making the next and most important advance in the science of high energy physics.

I also asked Dr. Williams the difference between an electron and a proton machine and received the following answer:

Representative WESTLAND. What is the difference between an electron and proton machine? What do you hope to find in one that you don't find in the other?

Dr. WILLIAMS. There is a very specific difference between them. In the electron machine one is investigating the interaction of electrons. On this chart you will see the electrons are the lightest of the real particles with any finite mass. Interacting through its electric field with the field of protons and neutrons in the nucleus, is called an electromagnetic interaction. Because of the nature of the theory we understand that interaction better. If we talk about the interaction of a proton or neutron with other protons and neutrons in the nucleus, that is a description which we really don't understand fully. So there is quite a different thing between proton and electron machines.

The opinions of our scientists about the value of this machine, and its importance in our continuing scientific competition with Soviet Russia, has been amply and convincingly demonstrated during the hearings before our committee.

In summary, this project has already been thoroughly studied. Further study will serve no useful purpose, but will cause more delay and increased ultimate costs. This accelerator will be able to perform new and important experiments considered extremely important by our scientists which will greatly advance knowledge and aid us in our continuing scientific competition with Soviet Russia.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second year President Eisenhower has requested construction authorization for a linear accelerator as a vital step in the field of high energy nuclear physics basic research. The United States is ahead in the field on a worldwide basis and to me it seems important that we stay out in front.

The action of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in failing to respond to the President's construction request will result in an unfortunate delay in obtaining such an accelerator. I support an amendment to H.R. 11713 for the project authorization. In other words, I favor the full request; not just $3 million for design studies. This is a fully tested and proven program and no good purpose will be served by a delay. On the contrary, the ultimate project cost would increase.

I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on this Friday afternoon I would like to present a proposition to my colleagues which I think will be attractive. If you will listen to me intently on this one point for 2 minutes, I guarantee you I will be through. Here it is.

Everyone here this afternoon has said that this accelerator should be built, but the only question is, Do we have reliable cost estimates?

Now, where is the major area where the cost estimates are doubted? The majority of the committee has said that it is in the area of cooling and shielding. Most scientists agree. Even the civil engineers cannot start their calculations until they know how much dirt and how much cement and concrete is to be required to shield this machine. Now then, how are we going to get reliable cost estimates for the cooling and shielding unless we have the best people available?

I will close by quoting the people who will be doing this job. They argue against partial authorization and they say "As an example, it would be impossible to recruit experienced high-energy particle physicists who would be involved in more detailed calculations of shielding."

My point is this: The only question is the cost estimate. The major part, or the major area in doubt, is the area of shielding and cooling, and we must have the most reliable and best technical people you can find to get this data. We do not think we can get them unless we have full authorization. I ask your support of the Hosmer amendment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, to authorize in full the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University. I believe that this is a very important project. But more than that, I believe that Congress should support our scientists. When a program and a project have been thoroughly reviewed by a top panel of distinguished scientists, who have made a unanimous, and an enthusiastic, recommendation, I believe we should give them support, especially in view of our continuing scientific competition with Soviet Russia.

First. The $3 million design and engineering authorization will delay the project and increase the total costs. I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter dated April 28, 1960, to me from the Honorable John A. McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. This letter indicates that, even assuming prompt authorization next year, commencement of useful experiments will be delayed an estimated 6 to 9 months, total estimated construction costs will be increased $2 to $3 million due to escalation, and possibly an additional $1 million more because of the uncertain status and inefficiency resulting from partial authorization.

Second. Staff recruitment will be difficult. As pointed out by this letter, it appears that the most serious effect of partial authorization will be "the lack of ability to recruit certain additional key scientists which Stanford considers essential in the development and design of the accelerator and experimental facilities." Many competent scientists have testified that the first step vital to a project of this importance is to recruit topnotch scientists and engineers. Under partial authorization this cannot be done.

Third. We are in a competition with Russia in the basic research fields. The scientists in our country, many of our best scientific minds, are terrifically excited and enthusiastic about the prospects of high energy physics—the discoveries which have been made, and the discoveries they feel can yet be made. I feel that if we in Congress falter, if we delay, if we give our scientists something short of complete, nonpolitical support, the United States will be the loser.

Our scientists tell us that funds for high energy physics should be increased, not decreased, and they are talking about this coming fiscal year 1961. I quote from the letter of February 5, 1960, from this special panel of scientists—pages 27–29 of our separate views:

At present the United States is leading the world in high-energy physics, one of

the most dynamic areas of science which, as a byproduct, is training some of our brightest physicists.

To maintain this leadership, to continue the growth of this science and to continue the training of some of our best minds, requires vigorous support by the Federal Government. The panel is concerned that the fiscal year 1961 budget for high-energy physics, as submitted to the Congress, is too low. The reduced construction obligation envisaged for fiscal year 1961, as compared with fiscal year 1960, implies a level of activity in the future which may jeopardize our present leading position in the world in this field. The authorization of the Stanford accelerator and other anticipated construction over the next 5 years, which the panel considers essential for an effective development of the high-energy physics field, will require an increasing annual expenditure for high-energy physics which may approach some $200 million by 1965.

With respect to project 61–f–7 in this bill—which the House will be asked to vote on this afternoon—the special panel of distinguished scientists clearly, forcefully, and unanimously stated its view, and I quote from page 27, appendix A to our separate views:

In particular, this panel wishes to reaffirm its recommendation to start immediately the construction of the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University, and to express its concern about the delay which has been encountered in authorizing this machine to date. All the experimental potentialities of this machine, which the panel foresaw last year, still look as attractive as they did then. In addition, new potentialities have developed for which this high-intensity, high-energy electron machine is well suited.

The scientific point of view is clear. The project deserves support.

I urge all Members of the House to vote for the amendment to authorize in full the linear electron accelerator proposed by Stanford University.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary to carry the debate a great deal further as far as the majority side is concerned. I have pointed out that in one instance we had an estimate for an accelerator that started out at $15 million and has now grown to $42 million. This particular estimate of $105 million or $107 million may be an accurate estimate, and it may not. We do not know. I point out NASA just recently let a contract to 1 of 12 bidders. The contract was for $18 million. In this particular instance it has mushroomed to $105 million and they tell us that it is going even higher on this particular project.

So, this is not a matter of being for or against science. This is a matter of spending American public funds in a constructive and sound manner. This Congress cannot be accused of not being for science. We are authorizing more than $9 billion a year for research and development in the scientific field, in addition to another $9 billion that is being spent by industry. This Nation is spending close to $18 billion a year in scientific research and development. But there is a great deal of waste in that spending in my opinion and whenever a responsible committee of the Congress can look at this very difficult and complicated problem, and can see that we can save a few million dollars, as we have already on this project, then I think it is the duty of that committee to do so. The majority feels that they are handling this in an orderly, sound and timely manner.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee support the majority position of the Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The reason I do so is to allay the fears of Members who I know are interested in the advancement of our research program. If this amendment is defeated it will not in any appreciable way delay a sound program in the field of high energy physics.

I am afraid that the impression has been left that unless we authorize immediately the Stanford accelerator we will cause a serious gap in the high energy field particularly as it relates to electron acceleration. This is not correct because within a year and a half a 6 billion electron volt electron accelerator will be completed at Cambridge, Mass. This will be an effective machine for electron acceleration that will contribute greatly to our high-energy research while we are perfecting the Stanford project.

It may be argued that the Cambridge machine is not a linear accelerator, which is true. But some scientists believe that you are not going to get much more information out of the linear accelerator than you will out of the Cambridge type. I am not going to argue that point. I do not know whether there is any basis for the argument. But at least some scientists argue this. This is an indication of the type of data that the majority of the committee wanted to have before giving full and complete authorization to the project.

I personally favor further consideration of the project early next year and I personally will appreciate the opportunity within a short time of voting for full authorization for the Stanford accelerator. But I think that what has transpired in the past year in the study of this project indicates that the committee is wise in seeking more cost data before giving final and complete authorization.

We know they originally intended to build the accelerator in a tunnel and when the committee did not rush the authorization last year a restudy indicated that the tunnel would have been a very critical and serious mistake. As a result of the committee's diligence the plans were changed.

I feel that what the committee is doing here is proceeding in an orderly fashion so that when we do come to the House for authorization of the Stanford accelerator we will be able to give our colleagues assurance of what the final cost estimate might be.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. I wanted to clear up the matter of the Cambridge electronic accelerator. It is roughly a 6-billion-electron-volt job as compared to a 20-billion-electron-volt job. In other words, the power of the Stanford accelerator is infinitely greater. It would be like doing a job with a tack hammer when the job requires a sledge hammer, which is the big linear accelerator that we have been talking about today.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman knows that the accelerator that we are talking about at the moment at Stanford is a 10-billion-electron-volt accelerator.

Mr. HOSMER. 10 to 20.

Mr. PRICE. The Cambridge accelerator can go up to 10 billion electron volts also.

Mr. HOSMER. I am sure it cannot go up to that figure because of the radiation loss.

Mr. PRICE. Scientists disagree with the gentleman. This would indicate that the argument is sound that we should proceed in orderly manner in all matters of authorization.

Mr. HOSMER. There is no argument among the scientists, there is only argument among the Congressmen.

Mr. PRICE. Only on whether we should authorize fully before we have all the data necessary to establish a firm cost estimate.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOSMER) there were ayes 53, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11713) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 513, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GUBSER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GUBSER moves to recommit the bill to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments: On page 1, line 7, strike out "$211,476,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$315,676,000"; and on page 4, lines 19 and 20, strike out "Project 61–f–7, design and engineering, linear electron accelerator, $3,000,000." and insert "Project 61–f–7, linear electron accelerator, $107,200,000."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GUBSER. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 128, nays 195, not voting 109, as follows:

[No. 83]

YEAS—128

Adair	Devine	McIntire
Alger	Dixon	Mason
Andersen, Minn.	Donohue	May
	Dooley	Meader
Arends	Dorn, N.Y.	Milliken
Auchincloss	Dwyer	Minshall
Avery	Elliott, Pa.	Monagan
Baker	Fenton	Mumma
Baldwin	Ford	Nelsen
Barry	Frelinghuysen	Norblad
Bass, N.H.	Fulton	Osmers
Bates	Gavin	Ostertag
Baumhart	Glenn	Pelly
Becker	Goodell	Philbin
Belcher	Griffin	Pirnie
Bennett, Mich.	Gubser	Poff
Bentley	Hagen	Quie
Berry	Halleck	Ray
Betts	Halpern	Rees, Kans.
Boland	Henderson	Richlman
Bolton	Hess	Robison
Bosch	Hiestand	Rogers, Mass.
Bow	Hoeven	Saylor
Broomfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Brown, Ohio	Holt	Schneebeli
Broyhill	Holtzman	Simpson
Burke, Mass.	Horan	Smith, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hosmer	Smith, Iowa
Cahill	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Cederberg	Johansen	Springer
Chenoweth	Judd	Taber
Chiperfield	Kearns	Teague, Calif.
Church	Keith	Thomson, Wyo.
Collier	King, Calif.	Tollefson
Conte	Knox	Utt
Cramer	Kyl	Van Zandt
Curtin	Laird	Wainwright
Curtis, Mass	Langen	Wallhauser
Curtis, Mo.	Latta	Weis
Daddario	Lindsay	Westland
Dague	Lipscomb	Widnall
Derounian	McCulloch	Wilson
Derwinski	McDonough	Younger

NAYS—195

Abbitt	Fascell	Karth
Abernethy	Feighan	Kasem
Addonizio	Fisher	Kastenmeier
Albert	Flood	Keogh
Anderson, Mont.	Flynn	Kilday
	Fogarty	Kilgore
Ashley	Foley	King, Utah
Ashmore	Forrester	Kluczynski
Aspinall	Fountain	Kowalski
Baring	Frazier	Lane
Barr	Friedel	Lankford
Barrett	Gallagher	Lesinski
Bass, Tenn.	Garmatz	Levering
Beckworth	Gary	Libonati
Bennett, Fla.	Gathings	McCormack
Blatnik	George	McFall
Brademas	Giaimo	McGinley
Bray	Granahan	McMillan
Breeding	Gray	McSween
Brewster	Green, Oreg.	Macdonald
Brock	Green, Pa.	Mack
Brooks, La.	Griffiths	Madden
Brown, Ga.	Gross	Mahon
Budge	Haley	Matthews
Burke, Ky.	Hardy	Metcalf
Byrne, Pa.	Hargis	Meyer
Cannon	Harmon	Miller, Clem
Casey	Harris	Mills
Coffin	Harrison	Moeller
Cohelan	Healey	Moorhead
Cooley	Hechler	Morgan
Cunningham	Herlong	Morris, Okla.
Daniels	Hogan	Moss
Davis, Tenn.	Holifield	Moulder
Delaney	Huddleston	Murphy
Denton	Hull	Murray
Diggs	Inouye	Natcher
Dingell	Irwin	Nix
Dorn, S.C.	Jarman	Norrell
Downing	Jennings	O'Brien, Ill.
Doyle	Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Dulski	Johnson, Colo.	O'Hara, Ill.
Durham	Johnson, Md.	O'Konski
Edmondson	Johnson, Wis.	O'Neill
Elliott, Ala.	Jonas	Oliver
Everett	Jones, Ala.	Passman
Evins	Jones, Mo.	Patman
Fallon	Karsten	Perkins
Pfost	Saund	Toll
Poage	Selden	Trimble
Preston	Shelley	Tuck
Price	Shipley	Udall
Prokop	Sikes	Ullman
Pucinski	Siler	Vanik
Quigley	Sisk	Vinson
Rabaut	Smith, Miss.	Whitener
Randall	Smith, Va.	Whitten
Reuss	Spence	Wier
Rhodes, Pa.	Staggers	Williams
Riley	Steed	Willis
Rodino	Stubblefield	Winstead
Rogers, Fla.	Sullivan	Wright
Roosevelt	Thomas	Yates
Rostenkowski	Thompson, N.J.	Zablocki
Roush	Thompson, Tex.	
Santangelo	Thornberry	

NOT VOTING—109

Alexander	Gilbert	Pilcher
Alford	Grant	Pillion
Allen	Hays	Porter
Andrews	Hébert	Powell
Anfuso	Hemphill	Rains
Ayres	Hoffman, Mich.	Reece, Tenn.
Bailey	Holland	Rhodes, Ariz.
Barden	Ikard	Rivers, Alaska
Blitch	Jackson	Rivers, S.C.
Boggs	Kee	Roberts
Bolling	Kelly	Rogers, Colo.
Bonner	Kilburn	Rogers, Tex.
Bowles	Kirwan	Rooney
Boykin	Kitchin	Rutherford
Brooks, Tex.	Lafore	St. George
Brown, Mo.	Landrum	Scherer
Buckley	Lennon	Schwengel
Burdick	Loser	Scott
Burleson	McDowell	Sheppard
Canfield	McGovern	Short
Carnahan	Machrowicz	Slack
Celler	Magnuson	Stratton
Chamberlain	Mailliard	Taylor
Chelf	Marshall	Teague, Tex.
Clark	Martin	Teller
Coad	Merrow	Thompson, La.
Colmer	Michel	Van Pelt
Cook	Miller, George P.	Walter
Corbett	Miller, N.Y.	Wampler
Davis, Ga.	Mitchell	Watts
Dawson	Montoya	Weaver
Dent	Moore	Wharton
Dowdy	Morris, N.Mex.	Withrow
Farbstein	Morrison	Wolf
Fino	Multer	Young
Flynt	O'Hara, Mich.	Zelenko
Forand		

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Kitchin against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Pilcher against.

Mr. Weaver for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Van Pelt for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Ikard against.

Mr. Allen for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against

Mr. Withrow for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Lafore for, with Mr. Watts against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Pillion for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Wharton for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Scherer for, with Mr. Farbstein against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Zelenko against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Chamberlain for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Moore for, with Mr. Teller against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Landrum against.

Mr. Short for, with Mrs. Blitch against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rains with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. KEARNS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 322, nays 2, not voting 109, as follows:

YEAS—322

Abbitt	Dorn, N.Y.	Kastenmeier
Abernethy	Dorn, S.C.	Kearns
Adair	Downing	Keith
Addonizio	Doyle	Keogh
Albert	Dulski	Kilday
Alger	Durham	Kilgore
Andersen, Minn.	Dwyer	King, Calif.
	Edmondson	King, Utah
Anderson, Mont.	Elliott, Ala.	Kluczynski
	Elliott, Pa.	Knox
Arends	Everett	Kowalski
Ashley	Evins	Kyl
Ashmore	Fallon	Laird
Aspinall	Fascell	Lane
Auchincloss	Feighan	Langen
Avery	Fenton	Lankford
Baker	Fisher	Latta
Baldwin	Flood	Lesinski
Baring	Flynn	Levering
Barr	Fogarty	Libonati
Barrett	Foley	Lindsay
Barry	Ford	Lipscomb
Bass, N.H.	Forrester	Loser
Bass, Tenn.	Fountain	McCormack
Bates	Frazier	McCulloch
Baumhart	Frelinghuysen	McDonough
Becker	Friedel	McFall
Beckworth	Fulton	McGinley
Belcher	Gallagher	McIntire
Bennett, Fla.	Garmatz	McMillan
Bennett, Mich.	Gary	McSween
Bentley	Gathings	Macdonald
Berry	Gavin	Mack
Betts	George	Madden
Blatnik	Giaimo	Mahon
Boland	Glenn	Mason
Bolton	Goodell	Matthews
Bosch	Granahan	May
Bow	Gray	Meader
Brademas	Green, Oreg.	Metcalf
Bray	Green, Pa.	Meyer
Breeding	Griffin	Miller, Clem
Brewster	Griffiths	Milliken
Brock	Gross	Mills
Brooks, La.	Hagen	Minshall
Broomfield	Haley	Moeller
Brown, Ga.	Halleck	Monagan
Brown, Ohio	Halpern	Moorhead
Broyhill	Hardy	Morgan
Budge	Hargis	Morris, Okla.
Burke, Ky.	Harris	Morrison
Burke, Mass.	Harrison	Moss
Byrne, Pa.	Healey	Moulder
Byrnes, Wis.	Hechler	Mumma
Cahill	Henderson	Murphy
Cannon	Herlong	Murray
Casey	Hess	Natcher
Cederberg	Hiestand	Nelsen
Chenoweth	Hoeven	Nix
Chiperfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Norblad
Church	Hogan	Norrell
Coffin	Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.
Cohelan	Holt	O'Brien, N.Y.
Collier	Holtzman	O'Hara, Ill.
Conte	Horan	O'Konski
Cooley	Hosmer	O'Neill
Cramer	Huddleston	Oliver
Cunningham	Hull	Osmers
Curtin	Inouye	Ostertag
Curtis, Mass.	Irwin	Passman
Curtis, Mo.	Jarman	Patman
Daddario	Jennings	Pelly
Dague	Jensen	Perkins
Daniels	Johansen	Pfost
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.	Philbin
Delaney	Johnson, Colo.	Pirnie
Denton	Johnson, Md.	Poage
Derounian	Johnson, Wis.	Poff
Derwinski	Jonas	Preston
Devine	Jones, Ala.	Price
Diggs	Jones, Mo.	Prokop
Dingell	Judd	Pucinski
Dixon	Karsten	Quie
Donohue	Karth	Quigley
Dooley	Kasem	Rabaut

Randall	Simpson	Tuck
Ray	Sisk	Udall
Rees, Kans.	Smith, Calif.	Ullman
Reuss	Smith, Iowa	Utt
Rhodes, Pa.	Smith, Kans.	Vanik
Riehlman	Smith, Miss.	Van Zandt
Riley	Smith, Va.	Vinson
Robison	Spence	Wainwright
Rodino	Springer	Wallhauser
Rogers, Fla.	Staggers	Weis
Rogers, Mass.	Steed	Westland
Rostenkowski	Stubblefield	Whitener
Roush	Sullivan	Whitten
Santangelo	Taber	Widnall
Saund	Teague, Calif.	Wier
Saylor	Thomas	Williams
Schenck	Thompson, N.J.	Wilson
Schneebeli	Thompson, Tex.	Winstead
Selden	Thomson, Wyo.	Wright
Shelley	Thornberry	Yates
Shipley	Toll	Younger
Sikes	Tollefson	Zablocki
Siler	Trimble	

NAYS—2

Gubser	Harmon

NOT VOTING—109

Alexander	Gilbert	Porter
Alford	Grant	Powell
Allen	Hays	Rains
Andrews	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Anfuso	Hemphill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Ayres	Hoffman, Mich.	Rivers, Alaska
Bailey	Holland	Rivers, S.C.
Barden	Ikard	Roberts
Blitch	Jackson	Rogers, Colo.
Boggs	Kee	Rogers, Tex.
Bolling	Kelly	Rooney
Bonner	Kilburn	Roosevelt
Bowles	Kirwan	Rutherford
Boykin	Kitchin	St. George
Brooks, Tex.	Lafore	Scherer
Brown, Mo.	Landrum	Schwengel
Buckley	Lennon	Scott
Burdick	McDowell	Sheppard
Burleson	McGovern	Short
Canfield	Machrowicz	Slack
Carnahan	Magnuson	Stratton
Celler	Mailliard	Taylor
Chamberlain	Marshall	Teague, Tex.
Chelf	Martin	Teller
Clark	Merrow	Thompson, La.
Coad	Michel	Van Pelt
Colmer	Miller, George P.	Walter
Cook	Miller, N.Y.	Wampler
Corbett	Mitchell	Watts
Davis, Ga.	Montoya	Weaver
Dawson	Moore	Wharton
Dent	Morris, N. Mex.	Willis
Dowdy	Multer	Withrow
Farbstein	O'Hara, Mich.	Wolf
Fino	Pilcher	Young
Flynt	Pillion	Zelenko
Forand		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Martin.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Porter with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Brooks of Texas with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. McGovern with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Wampler with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Wolf with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Cook with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Lafore.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Short.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Burdick with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. HOGAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEN. MELVIN MAAS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, especially those of us who served with Gen. Melvin J. Maas when he was a Member of the House, who is the head of the physically handicapped group in the country, rejoice he was reappointed by President Eisenhower. He served in World War I. He was in Congress and left to serve in the Army. He returned after the war to the Congress and went back to serve in the Army in World War II.

In the House one day the Congress had an opportunity to witness his courage. One day I saw him catch a loaded revolver thrown down by a man, who was a mental case, in the gallery of the House, a very dangerous and brave thing to do. He has done an outstanding job for the handicapped. General Maas is blind which gives him a special understanding of those who have a physical disability. He has been an inspiration to them and to the entire country.

The President did well to reappoint him. He has done a marvelous job.

The following is the last sheet of the several days conference the President called:

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

THURSDAY MORNING, MAY 5, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM

Presiding: Earl Gammons, former Vice Chairman, President's Committee.

8:30: Registration.

9:30: Musical selections, U.S. Marine Band.

10: Presentation of colors, Marine Corps Color Guard.

"Star Spangled Banner."

Invocation: Rabbi Harry J. Kaufman, Beth Sholom Congregation and Talmud Torah, Washington, D.C.

Introduction: Rollcall of States.

In memoriam: Vice Adm. Ross T. McIntire (MC), U.S. Navy, retired.

Welcome: Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, retired, Chairman, President's Committee.

Musical selections.

11:15: Introduction of the President of the United States.

Address by the President of the United States.

Presentation of awards by the President.

National essay contest winners.

President's trophy, "Handicapped American of the Year," Dwight D. Guilfoil Jr., Arlington Heights, Ill.

11:45: Lunch recess.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, MAY 5, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM

Presiding: Earl Gammons, former Vice Chairman, President's Committee.

1:30: Address, Rudolph F. Bannow, president, National Association of Manufacturers.

2: Address by labor representative (to be selected).

2:30: Panel—Utilizing Handicapped Workers in Small Business.

Moderator: Philip McCallum, Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

Members: "Selection, Training, and Assignment," Carl Strahle, Steiner & Co., Milford, Del.

"Promotion and Transfer" (to be selected).

"Supervision," Leo Weisfield, Weisfield's Jewelers, Seattle, Wash.

"Management's Relationship With Agencies Serving the Handicapped," Aaron Solomon, Ace Electronics Association, Inc., Somerville, Mass.

3:30: Discussion.

4: Recess.

5:30–7:30: Reception, Presidential Arms, 1320 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 6, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM

Presiding: Earl Gammons, former vice Chairman, President's Committee.

9: Musical selections.

9:15: Remarks, V. J. Skutt, president, Mutual of Omaha, Omaha, Nebr.

Film, "The Biggest Bridge in Action."

9:50: Report of executive committee, Earl Gammons, former vice chairman, President's Committee.

10:05: Address, Vivian Acord, public information director, Indiana Association of Mental Health.

10:25: Address, Waldo Stephens, chairman, Oklahoma Governor's Committee.

10:45: Cartoon varieties, Allen Saunders, chairman, Cartoonist Committee, Toledo, Ohio.

12: Lunch recess.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, MAY 6, GRAND BALLROOM, WILLARD HOTEL

12:15: International luncheon.

Musical selections.

Toastmistress, Mrs. Raymond Clapper.

Invocation, Rev. John Graham, minister, Lewinsville Presbyterian Church, McLean, Va.

1:15: Addresses: Miss Jayne Shover, associate director, National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Inc.

Miss Mary E. Switzer, Director, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

2: Benediction, Rear Adm. George A. Rosso, U.S. Navy, Chief of Chaplains.

This morning four gracious, devout, and inspired nuns who are teachers at Keith Hall in Lowell, where I live, brought with them the lovely girl, and her father and mother, who won an essay contest sponsored by the President Eisenhower Committee for the Physically Handicapped, and 48 fine young girls from their Keith Hall school. We breakfasted together and then saw a little of the beautiful Capitol before going to the Conference for the Physically Handicapped.

I felt very proud today of the young essay winner and the splendid Sisters and their group of students. Many fine compliments were paid to the group. I want the House to know the names of the Sisters and the girls of Keith Hall who came to the Capitol.

Sister Mary Ursulita, L.S.J., principal of Keith Hall, would have been proud of her group. I heard very many comments of approval, both of their behavior and their looks.

The Sisters are Sister Mary Agnello, Sister Mary Therezon, Sister Mary Fonthanne, and Sister Mary Gertruda.

The students are Betty Riopelle, Geraldine Perisino, Janice St. Onge, Maureen Rourke, Joan Zawodney, Mary Jane Gath, Mary Ann Nison, Antonia Elias, Maureen Shanahan, Martha Monazynski, Eleanor Poirier, Carol Sadowski, Catherine Dalton, Roberta McBride, Eileen Desmond, Leona McCaughey, Honey Blazonis, Phyllis Zaleski, Marilyn Sheahan, Sharon Coulter, Sandra McAleer, Barbara Milner, Maryanne Chibas, Dona Craig, Priscilla Frechette, Beverly Melanson, Margaret Cotter, Joyce Richey, Carol St. Jean, Francine Lynch, Gloria Girard, Linda Salce, Sandra Oliver, Dorothy McMahon, Marilyn McParland, Lana Brule, Carolyn Clark, Betsy Parent, Sue Parent, Dorothy Patenaude, Cathy Crane, Sheila McOsker, Lorraine Hebert, MaryJo Plumley, Judith Pulsifer, Mary Vieria—also Mr. and Mrs. Vieria and Anthony, her brother.

Mrs. Salce and Mrs. Oliver accompanied the group.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 10809, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. FULTON, and Mr. MCDONOUGH.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 11713, the atomic energy authorization bill under consideration today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

A LIBERTY BELL SHRINE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the district which I have the honor to represent is fortunate in many ways, not the least of which is the fact that we are pridefully endowed with a uniquely rich heritage of history. The counties of Bucks and Lehigh, which together make up the Eighth Pennsylvania District, have contributed immeasurably to the cultural and economic growth of this Nation since the founding struggles of our Republic.

What is not generally known, however, is that during a critical period in our Nation's beginning years the Liberty Bell, symbol of our American free way of life, was brought from Philadelphia and hidden in Zion's Church in Allentown, Lehigh County. This event occurred during the period between September 24, 1777, and July 10, 1778. The bell, then known as the State House Bell, was secretly removed from Philadelphia to guard against its capture by the British, who invaded Philadelphia after the battles of Brandywine and Germantown. There is no disagreement among historians as to the fact that the bell found a haven in a church basement in Allentown; the only controversy has centered on which of two men provided the team of horses to haul the bell.

Perhaps the best authority for the story of the flight to Allentown with the Liberty Bell can be found in the account written by Dr. Simon Sipple, pastor of Zion Church, 1910–47, and pastor emeritus until his death in 1956.

Dr. Sipple, in his book "History of Zion Reformed Church," points out that there are many people who do not know that the Liberty Bell was hidden in Allentown and others who only know a fragmentary bit of the account.

THE SIPPLE STORY

He wrote:

It was to Allentown (or Northampton Town, as the struggling village then was known) that the Liberty Bell made its first trip.

In September 1777, a little more than a year after the bell had fired the hearts of the patriots by proclaiming freedom throughout the land, the British became rather too numerous for comfort in the vicinity of Philadelphia.

At a meeting of the executive council it was decided to send the Liberty Bell * * * to some distant settlement. The British were in need of ammunition, and what a delight it would have been to them to convert the herald of freedom into cannon balls!

NORTHAMPTON SELECTED

The patriotism and loyalty to the Continental cause of the citizens of Northampton Town were well known to the Executive Council, and it was decided to entrust the Liberty Bell to the care of the people of this village.

In those days farmers from this region made frequent trips to Philadelphia. They would arrive in the city with wagonloads of produce and return emptyhanded.

WAGONS COVERED

On the returning farm wagons the bells were packed, they being carefully covered with potato sacks and the refuse of stables.

The announcement was then made that the Liberty Bell had been buried in the waters of the Delaware.

Many people are still under the impression that the Delaware was the hiding place of the bell, but that this is wrong is shown by the following entry in the diary of the Moravian Church, at Bethlehem, under the date of September 25, 1777:

WAGON BREAKS DOWN

"The bells from Philadelphia were brought in wagons. The wagon with the statehouse bell broke down here, so it had to be unloaded. The other bells went on."

John Jacob Mickley drove the team on which the Liberty Bell was loaded. After his wagon broke down Frederick Leaser, another farmer, came along and the bell was loaded on his wagon and the journey to Northampton resumed.

Arriving at this place the bells, together with the church chimes, were hidden underneath the floor of the old Zion Reformed Church, the pastor, the Reverend Abraham Blumer, assisting in the concealment.

RETURNED IN 1778

Here the bells remained until after the evacuation of Philadelphia by the British in the latter part of 1778, when they were taken back to Philadelphia.

The tablet, which recognizes that Frederick Leaser also deserves mention, was erected in Zion Reformed Church November 1908. It reads as follows:

In commemoration of the saving of the Liberty Bell from the British, September 1777.

Erected to the memory of John Jacob Mickley, commisary of issues and member of the central committee from Whitehall Township, Northampton County, Pa., who under cover of darkness and with his farm team hauled the Liberty Bell from Independence Hall, Philadelphia, through the British lines to Bethlehem where the wagon broke down, September 23, 1777. The bell was then transferred to Frederick Leaser's wagon and brought to Allentown, September 24, 1777. It was placed beneath the floor of Zion Reformed Church and remained secreted for nearly a year. This tablet is placed by order of the Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, June 2, 1907, under the auspices of the Pennsylvania Daughters of the American Revolution. Erected October 15, 1908. Mrs. Alfred G. Saeger, chairman; Miss Minnie Mickley, secretary, of the John Jacob Mickley Memorial Committee appointed by Mrs. Allen P. Perley, State Regent of Pennsylvania, N.S.D.A.R.

Only in recent months, however, has action been taken to bring this significant milestone out into the full light of public knowledge and appreciation. A committee of public-spirited citizens has established the Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown, a group dedicated to the commemoration of the place where possibly the greatest symbol of freedom was protected to the everlasting glory of the whole world.

The Liberty Bell Shrine has wasted no time in making up for lost years. It is just a little over 1 year ago, on April 25, 1959, to be exact, that a handsome replica of the Liberty Bell was formally presented to Zion's Reformed Church—United Church of Christ—at impressive ceremonies in front of the original church on Hamilton Street, Allentown. The replica was presented by grant of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and today may be seen proudly reposing in front of the church which served as a haven for the bell nearly 200 years ago.

The Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown was incorporated as a nonprofit corporation by the Lehigh County court of common pleas on September 22, 1959, and

has been making remarkable strides ever since under the able chairmanship of Dr. Morgan D. Person. It should be noted that the group has been working in close liaison with the bicentennial committee of Zion's Church, which will observe the 200th year of the founding of Zion's Church in 1962.

Since last September and to the present date, the Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown has been working zealously and with unselfish devotion to build a permanent shrine in which the replica of the Liberty Bell can be housed, preferably in the original surroundings beneath Zion's Church where the original bell was hidden. To this end, there will soon be launched in the city of Allentown and the general Lehigh Valley area a public subscription drive to raise sufficient funds to erect a fitting home in which to place the Liberty Bell replica. The realization of this goal of building a shrine will accomplish three things:

First. It will serve to mark for all time the place where the emblem of American liberty was kept—a unique instance of church and state working together to save an enduring symbol of freedom.

Second. It will function as a mecca for thousands, including young people, who visit the shrine and who will be reminded of this heritage of freedom that we enjoy.

Third. It will serve to challenge us to the renewed importance of always being worthy of our heritage.

The Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown is confident that the public will respond promptly and generously to the building fund appeal. Certainly no cause is more deserving from the standpoint of enduring value and its meaning to future generations of Americans.

Still another event has recently taken place which is probably a first in the entire history of our Nation. I refer to the "Portrait of Freedom," in which a remarkable organization of artists working together as the Lehigh Art Alliance have collaborated with the Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown to present a very fine project that has resulted in the creation of the "Portrait of Freedom" with the sitter being the Liberty Bell Shrine itself.

This "Portrait of Freedom" was unveiled to the public on Monday, April 25, on the main floor showroom of the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. in Allentown. This is the seventh such community project undertaken by the Lehigh Art Alliance, and is proving invaluable in providing additional visual impact and significance of the shrine's meaning. This project has produced a very fine collection of paintings and other art works to a total portrait number of 47, the selections made from total entries of more than 100 by a distinguished jury comprising Ralph Somers Walter, curator of design, Pennsylvania State Museum; Charles T. Coiner, vice president and art director, N. W. Ayer & Son, Independence Square, Philadelphia; and Clarence H. Carter, well-known artist, Frenchtown, N.J.

With the presentation of the "Portrait of Freedom," Lehigh Art Alliance explores one of the oldest and most powerful of man's motivations since the beginning of his civilized existence—freedom. In the words of Quentin Smith, director of development for the art alliance:

> The sitter idea for this undertaking, seventh in the alliance's "Portraits of Our Times" series, has none of the well-defined shapes and patterns of industry which have characterized previous portraits presented during the past decade.
>
> Freedom has such a variety of meanings to each of us that few of the living artists of the world could hope to successfully encompass all of its many ramifications into one painting or piece of sculpture.
>
> Therefore, we have dared to assay its forms and meanings on a collective basis, hoping that, together, these works in oil, clay, and metal will merit their creation through worthwhile service in renewing and stimulating some greater present-day consciousness and appreciation of this priceless heritage that has been handed down into our safekeeping. The true measure of the success of this undertaking can only be found in the extent that this is accomplished.
>
> The Freedom Portrait was created by the Lehigh Art Alliance as a public service and, specifically, to service the aims of the Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown—which is cooperating in making this first showing of these art forms possible.
>
> This organizaion of area citizens was founded for the purpose of developing a shrine to freedom, commemorating the flight to and sheltering of the Liberty Bell at Zion United Church of Christ, Allentown, during the British occupation of Philadelphia in 1777.
>
> At the same time Washington and his ragged troops were enduring that harsh winter encamped at Valley Forge, the bell, symbol of the hopes of all men aspiring toward freedom, had its own Valley Forge in Allentown.
>
> The development of a freedom shrine in this area merits the interest and support of every member of the community.
>
> With its realization we will be forging a local link into the chain of our Nation's history and creating a tangible and enduring reminder to our children that freedom is not an inheritance but a heritage to be cherished and won anew by each succeeding generation.

This portrait will be seen elsewhere in Allentown for the remainder of the month of May, and for the following 2 months will hang in the State museum in Pennsylvania's capital, Harrisburg. Eventually, we hope that it may be deemed worthy—as I feel certain it will—of being sponsored for audiences in other cities of the United States and for showing in countries overseas.

Mr. Speaker, Allentown and Lehigh County are to be commended for this splended contribution to an important and meaningful chapter in America's history. We are proud to have been the haven for the Liberty Bell at a critical time of history, and we look forward soon to seeing this eventful occasion being permanently memorialized in a proper setting—indeed almost the exact place where the Liberty Bell was kept safe from harm back in 1777. I congratulate the Liberty Bell Shrine of Allentown, the Lehigh Art Alliance, and Zion's Church for their unselfish advocacy of one of our country's finest traditions.

PRESIDENT URGED TO SIGN AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday the House passed the area redevelopment bill, S. 722. This afternoon the other body accepted the House version of the bill, the bill is on its way to the White House.

I wish to issue an urgent appeal to the President of the United States to sign this bill which will mean so much to the economy of my State of West Virginia and, indeed, to the economy of the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modest bill which calls for loans and grants of $251 million which actually is only 6 percent of the $4 billion foreign aid bill which the President has asked this Congress to pass. Two hundred million dollars of the $251 million is in loans. I believe that the people in our own country are a very good risk for loans. I believe that if we can grant technical assistance to foreign lands, our own people deserve technical assistance too.

In my hometown of Huntington, W. Va., the unemployment rate is running around 13 or 14 percent. We have exerted all of the initiative we can through the united fund, through industrial development bodies, through the chamber of commerce, and through widespread local grassroots efforts which won the city of Huntington the title "All-American City" last year. We have done everything possible to solve this problem locally.

I believe we could use the type of assistance in retraining grants, community facilities grants, and loans for the development of industrial property that are contained in the area redevelopment bill. I therefore hope the President in his wisdom will sign this bill which will mean so much to West Virginia and to the Nation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I gladly yield to my colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to associate myself with the statement of my colleague from West Virginia as to the desirability and the urgency of the President signing this bill, because a majority of the elected Representatives of the people of the United States has voted for the bill after study and ample hearings, enough I am sure, to establish the merit and need of the legislation.

The area redevelopment bill, introduced as S. 722 by the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS, passed the Senate on March 23, 1959, and by the House on May 4, 1960, is essentially a humanitarian measure. Appropriations set up the bill are relatively insignificant. The total amounts of loans and grants authorized, if used to the limit, will admittedly go only a short way toward providing jobs for every unemployed person in the United States. Their practical purpose is to initiate and set free local investment in industrial and business enter-

prises which will provide innumerable opportunities for jobs for the jobless. In doing this, the effect of the loans authorized will be multiplied indefinitely. Establishment of one industry in a depressed area will suggest to local investors other industries for which resources are available, and additional prospects for success and profits. It has always been the history of economic development that one industry breeds another. Industries tend to multiply and proliferate in given areas because one industry in a sense supports and protects another. Thus we can expect that the provisions of this bill, if utilized vigorously, will have far-reaching effects in economic rehabilitation of distressed areas, far more than the industrial building value of the small sum appropriated. Furthermore, since the loans constitute only 65 percent of the capital needed, and since they are repayable, the revolving nature of the fund will reduce the necessity for continued appropriations.

It has been argued that enterprises set up under the bill will be necessarily hazardous and that they are doomed to failure. On this point it is appropriate to remark that the bill stipulates full and complete analysis of the resources available for a proposed enterprise, together with study of market conditions and all other factors contributing to success, before a loan is approved. The enterprises set up under these conditions will be totally unlike small businesses set up on the hunch of some private individual or corporation. Conditions favorable to success, as determined by experts and not by untrained business amateurs, must be present before action is started. Our discussions have indicated that many possibilities for industrial development almost certainly exist in many of the distressed areas. But we do not propose to go into those areas and set up establishments haphazardly, even on the basis of facts that seem on their face indisputable. We propose that conditions and resources be thoroughly investigated by those who have the business know-how before we act. Our duty to those who supply a significant proportion of the required capital demands that we shield them as far as possible from disaster. We emphatically do not want them to risk and lose their money in unprofitable enterprises. Consequently the percent of failure in small businesses common to less carefully considered projects should be materially different for these Government-promoted operations.

The purpose of the statements offered above is to indicate that the practical effects of the moneys authorized by the bill will be vastly greater than the use of such small amounts for industrial development which would not be supplemented by local interest, drive, and capital investment. That is, the psychological consequences of the bill should overpower the practical consequences.

However, the psychological effects would fall with still greater force on the thousands of unemployed. The demoralizing effect of long and continuous unemployment is practically paralyzing on workers possessed of but a single skill or trade. They are completely helpless in finding another job or another trade. They read daily in the papers of efforts to relieve the distress of similarly situated people in foreign lands. They hear that the Congress is appropriating annually billions of dollars for that purpose, with the approval of the administration. They wonder why the Nation should not try to do for them what it is doing for other people no more in need, but thousands of miles away. Approval of this bill will provide a tremendous moral stimulant for them. They will be energized by the fact that their Government does care for them in some more practical way than in passing out a few trifling handouts of food. In fact, they do need a spur to action. A spur may well set them into individual effort in their own behalf, for they are not lazy, indifferent, and irresponsible people. They want to work and to make their own way in the world. They have simply been paralyzed by the staggering blow of unemployment until they can not initiate action of their own will and effort. This bill should offer them just enough help to get started again. That is all those of us who have supported the bill have hoped for.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I would like to second what the gentlemen from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER and Mr. STAGGERS] have said. I served on the subcommittee which considered this legislation. I was extremely distressed during general debate in the House to hear certain Members indicate that this subcommittee had not discharged its responsibilities and was bringing irresponsible legislation to the floor for consideration. I do not believe anyone could have sat on that subcommittee and listened to the appalling testimony which we received, not of simple unemployment, not of continuous unemployment, but of unemployment which had become a cancer to those areas not for months, but for years without being concerned. I was amazed to hear Members say that the situation had so radically changed from last year, between the time this subcommittee reported the bill and when it reached the floor. We had evidence to indicate that these were areas of longtime suffering.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] was one of the most eloquent witnesses in this regard. He brought tape recordings before our subcommittee of actual interviews with the people of West Virginia that would have brought tears to your eyes. How anybody could have made the assertions and the accusations which were made on the floor, how the Committee on Rules could have considered the matter in the way it did in light of this testimony, is beyond me. As a member of this subcommittee, and I attended every single one of the hearings, we brought a responsible piece of legislation to the floor of the House. We were soundly vindicated by the membership of this body at that time.

I wonder if anyone noticed the ambivalence of those who opposed the bill? Fifty percent said that there was no problem, that it was a depression measure for a situation which has cured itself. The other 50 percent said there was a problem, but nothing could be done about it. Which way is it going to be. I noticed that those who were closest to the facts revealed at the hearings took the latter view. To contend that we can do nothing about the situation is not merely defeatist, but begs the entire question. We cannot find out whether anything can be accomplished until we take the steps to find out. That is what this bill is for—to find the facts.

There is one other matter, I would like to raise, and that concerns charges that the administrator of the agency proposed by this legislation would be a czar or a dictator. Would he be any more so than any of the other administrators we now have for dozens of agencies? Of course he would not. He would have the same powers and limitations, he would have the same discretion to act, the same sense of responsibility to use appropriated funds wisely, in those areas where it is most needed. It is absurd to scare us with claims that these funds for area redevelopment would be lost in New York, Detroit, or Philadelphia. Certainly, we must have more confidence in the discretion and temperateness of any individual selected for such a job and approved by the Senate.

There is one more thing I would like to say with respect to this legislation. This is not a depressed area bill; this is an area redevelopment bill. I wish to emphasize that point because there were a number of challenges by opponents on the floor of the House Wednesday defying us to stand up and tell why this legislation was necessary. When I asked the gentlemen to yield in order to accept the challenges, I was put off. I am here to say now that I am prepared at any time to answer those challenges, and particularly with respect to the reasons for this legislation. The purpose of this legislation is to provide a workshop and a laboratory of knowledge about the cancer of continuous unemployment. This is not a bill for West Virginia, for Kentucky, for Pennsylvania, or for any other area which is suffering from unemployment in particular. This is legislation for the entire United States, for any area where technological unemployment might strike at any time in a serious manner, whether it be California, Texas, Arkansas, Minnesota—wherever there is technological unemployment. We must find out what can be done. We need facts.

I would like to remind the Members of this body that with the increasing speed of technological change, this is not going to be an occasional phenomenon, and hence, the need for facts will double and redouble. It is for this reason that I would like to join with the gentleman from West Virginia in urging the President to sign this legislation, not to relieve a specific area, perhaps, but to provide us with the raw material upon which we can develop the factual

information to combat and conquer this problem. I recall those who on the floor said that the funds for this problem were just a drop in the bucket; that this would not solve the problem in even one district of Pennsylvania. This is no reason to oppose the legislation. You have to learn basic facts before you can attack a problem wholesale. This is the logical, cautious way to proceed. We have heard all kinds of charges and countercharges about the usefulness or uselessness of an approach such as this. There is no evidence either way to back up the asseverations on one side or the other. This is additional reasoning why we need the data which the application of this bill would furnish us, to give us the backstopping to conquer this problem in a coordinated way. Again, I would like to urge that the President of the United States sign this legislation into law so that we can go forward with the job of accomplishing area redevelopment problems to solve the problem of technological change which is a national problem of the first magnitude, and promises to grow more serious as time goes on.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from West Virginia and the other Members who have spoken here with reference to the need and desirability for the President to sign the legislation which I understand has gone down to his office today. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the observations which were made by the gentleman from California just now are extremely pertinent, which indicate beyond any shadow of doubt that this legislation is needed, to take care of unemployment that has persisted over these many years in ever-increasing numbers in some areas, including my own. It is not only necessary to take care of that condition, but it is also necessary to take care of any future unemployment that could be caused by technological upsets or advances or by any changes in the patterns of weaponry in the various sections of the country. The people of my State, Mr. Speaker, have gotten a great deal of encouragement from the action which was taken by this House, and I know that they will get a similar reaction when they know about the Senate action today. They are hoping and expecting that the President of the United States will go along with the Congress in approving this highly desirable and I may say, much-needed legislation. I join with the gentleman from West Virginia in the observations he has made and I thank him very much for the opportunity to so express myself.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday morning the Charleston Gazette carried this story, and I quote:

President Eisenhower has given assurances of lending a hand toward helping West Virginia with its economic problems, Governor Underwood reported yesterday from Washington after a conference with the President.

Governor Underwood said President Eisenhower promised to urge all Federal agencies "to do what they could to help West Virginia."

On the strength of that I have sent a telegram to the Governor of my State as follows:

HON. CECIL UNDERWOOD:

Hope you will personally urge President Eisenhower to sign S. 722 the area redevelopment bill which will mean so much to the State of West Virginia and the economy of the entire Nation. The bill has passed both the House and Senate and will soon be on its way to the President.

I believe the way to help immediately would be for the President to sign the bill.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to voice my concurrence in the statements of the gentleman from West Virginia with respect to the urgency of this legislation in the sincere hope that the President will be prevailed upon to sign it into law. Of the three counties in the State of Ohio that are terribly affected at the present time by unemployment, one of them is within the confines of my district. I feel there are a number of other counties in my district affected just as badly. Every time I go down to visit with the people there the question is always raised, "What can be done to help us get on our feet?" My people are not interested in handouts. They do not want donations from the Government. They do, however, wish to have the opportunity, a favorable opportunity, through loans to get on their feet economically. For that reason I feel it is of great urgency. I know my district is very much like the district which the gentleman from West Virginia so ably represents. Our people are in dire need at this time of help and I sincerely hope that the President will be prevailed upon to sign this into law.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from across the Ohio River in the 10th District of Ohio.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I should like enthusiastically to endorse what the gentleman from West Virginia has said, and to associate myself with him in his remarks. I come from a State, the State of Utah, which according to the committee report, would not receive one penny from this area redevelopment legislation, for the reason that there is not one community in Utah that would now qualify.

I endorse this legislation because it is basically and inherently right.

May I at this time commend the gentleman from West Virginia for the diligent, the vigorous, and the courageous fight which he has waged with others to secure the passage of this legislation. I have observed the gentleman. I have the privilege of sitting near him in the Space Committee. I have observed him in action. I know that he has raised his voice many times in behalf of this legislation. I know of his persuasiveness among his colleagues, and I have no question but that the passage of this bill has, in large measure, been due to his own particular efforts.

May I add this further thought. The President of the United States, just 1 day before this bill was taken up by this body, sent us a message in which he insisted, among other things, that action be taken in this general area of legislation.

I should like to quote one or two sentences from his message. The President said:

Area redevelopment legislation also needs priority attention. I have long urged legislation authorizing loans and technical assistance to help areas afflicted with long-term substantial unemployment resulting from technological changes. The purpose is to diversify these economies and thereby create new sources of private employment.

And he concludes by saying:

For this purpose I have recommended a Federal program amounting to $53 million to be expended for loans and technical assistance.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I make the assertion: If the President of the United States in delivering this message was sincere—and I am certain that he was, I do not question his sincerity for a minute—then this is the time for that sincerity to become manifest by his approving the bill that will be shortly placed upon his desk. I join with the gentleman from West Virginia in appealing to him to do this.

Mr. HECHLER. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Utah.

In that very same message which the gentleman from Utah cited, the President pointed out with reference to the mutual security funds:

Widespread chaos and misery cannot provide a world climate in which our free Republic can prosper and remain secure. There is for America no higher purpose nor greater need than to measure up to her world leadership responsibilities.

It seems to me that this is a challenge which applies not alone to the world but to our own front doorstep as well.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman in the well, the distinguished Representative from West Virginia, my good and valued friend, Mr. HECHLER, not only for voicing an appeal to the President at this time but for the fine, hard fight he has made for this legislation for many long, hard months. Few Members have contributed in fuller measure to the passage of the bill in the House.

Mr. Speaker, at this time everybody in America must be alerted to the condition that obtains in the State of West Virginia. This primary contest there has served to focus attention upon the plight of the people of West Virginia. I do hope that the President of the United States will have the heart and the vision quickly to sign into law a measure that is a matter of life or death to so many fine families in the distressed areas.

At the present time we do not have in my district the condition that is now

so widespread in West Virginia, but the day is not far off in this changing period, where one industry is folding up and another is expanding, when people must have available to them training to go from a job in one employment to another in a different field. So much now is needed in West Virginia, southern Illinois, parts of Ohio, and other States, but not immediately needed in my district. Yet very soon it will be needed in my district. I do hope the President of the United States will have the vision to contemplate what is ahead and the importance of this measure, not only for the present relief of the suffering of unemployed families, but for the safeguarding of the future in an age of automation.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank my friend from Illinois. I think his remarks and the remarks of my friend from Utah indicate that even though their districts are not directly affected they have the statesmanship to understand what this bill will do for the economy of the Nation. When Khrushchev says he is going to bury us he does not mean with bombs, he means economically. In order for this Nation to move forward economically we can no longer afford the luxury of chronic distressed areas, or pockets of unemployment.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEVERING. I rise to compliment my colleague from the State of West Virginia on the statement he is making urging the President to sign the depressed areas bill which passed the House and Senate and will be sent to the White House for the President's consideration. I think it is extremely appropriate that we consider this matter today especially in view of the policy of our Government of late to award defense contracts to foreign companies. I am sure we would all agree that if we are to successfully meet the threat of communism we must remain economically strong. It happens that at this very time I and other Members of the Congress are very much concerned about whether a defense contract for 39 locomotives for the Panama Canal Co. to tow ships through the locks will be awarded to the Plymouth Locomotive Co. in my district, a fine small company hiring less than 250 people, or whether it will be awarded to a Japanese firm, the Mitsubishi Co., one of the world's largest combines and with one of the cheapest labor markets in the world. We have been contending that we really ought to mean what we say about wanting to help small business in America under the terms of the Buy American Act and the Small Business Act.

Administration leaders have done a great deal of talking about how we want small business to participate in these defense contracts, but I am appalled day after day to see some of our fine small businesses having to yield to some foreign bidders on our defense contracts. I know in this particular case in Plymouth, Ohio, we have an unemployment situation now which is growing worse and fast approaching the condition of a critically distressed area. Again I say the gentleman's remarks are extremely appropriate today. The President ought to give favorable consideration to this legislation for the reasons he has so clearly stated. I am confident that the "anybody but America" policies of the administration—the policies which seem to suggest that we can afford anything for peoples abroad but cannot afford to meet the needs of our own, has helped to a great extent in causing distressed areas throughout this land of ours.

Mr. Speaker, the law firm headed by a former candidate for President of the United States, representing the Mitsubishi Co., I am told, is contending that the future of our relations with Japan may hinge on the decision in this Locomotive case. It seems to me this is hardly an endorsement of our foreign aid program under which we have spent some $2,526,000 since the end of World War II up to June 30, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a great deal of encouragement in my fight on behalf of Plymouth from the people in my own 17th Ohio District. This is only natural. But some of my colleagues and I have received many communications from all parts of the country in support of my position in this case. In this connection I insert in the RECORD at this point some typical messages which express the concern of our citizens about the threat from foreign competition to our own economic well-being:

Hon. ROBERT W. LEVERING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEVERING: I have written my Senator that my vote is for Plymouth Locomotive Works. This Nation is giving away all its money. Now it's giving away its jobs, we're holding up the world and letting our own down. We rose, and now we're falling fast (who will write of our "Rise and Fall"?).

A KEY WESTER.

MIAMI, FLA., *April 23, 1960.*

Hon. ROBERT W. LEVERING.

DEAR SIR: I read with interest, in my local paper, that you are blocking the Japanese Mitsubishi Co. from obtaining an Army contract.

As a former Japanese prisoner of war, captured on Bataan, I am with you 100 percent. Thank God for men like you, who know what it is to suffer in a war, who now have the opportunity to speak out and make themselves heard.

By all means give the contract to Americans. Perhaps, if some of the members of your opposition would have been subjected to some of that wartime Japanese hospitality, they wouldn't be so eager to please the Japanese businessman.

So keep up the good work, Mr. LEVERING, I know that I am not the only ex-GI that agrees with you.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS ZOLEUSKI.

BROADWAY DISCOUNT SALES,
Alliance, Ohio, April 23, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT W. LEVERING.

SIR: In your fight to keep the Army contract in this country is something everyone should go along with. Just like in World War II, you are fighting for a good cause. Not every time money is the most important. I, like you, feel this contract should go to the Mansfield firm.

ROY C. GUESS.

OMAHA, NEBR., *April 27, 1960.*

GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Esq.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GLENN: One of your fellow Congressmen, ROBERT W. LEVERING from Ohio, is endeavoring to keep a contract to furnish our Army some 39 locomotives at $3,829,900, for use on the Panama Canal, from going to the Mitsubishi Co. in Japan. Mr. LEVERING is endeavoring to have the contract awarded to the Plymouth Locomotive Works, near Mansfield, Ohio for $4,741,867. The latter will pay the Government close to $500,000 taxes. For the difference in quality of materials and workmanship the Government will get a great deal more than the $500,000 in taxes. Mr. LEVERING puts up some excellent arguments why the Plymouth firm should be awarded the contracts and I agree with him 100 percent.

I hope, GLENN, you can find time to give Mr. LEVERING an "assist" on this.

Sincerely yours,

PHI T. GRAHAM.

Mr. LEVERING: You may be surprised to get word anybody out of your district, especially as far west as Omaha, could be interested in your effort, but I'm not a native of the Buckeye State for nothing. I still love it.

PHILIP GRAHAM.

(From Portsmouth.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to my distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. While it is very well to urge the President to sign this bill, I am going to go further and say that the President should sign the bill. This bill is an investment in America. I wish the President would take a little time and go out and visit these depressed areas. He has traveled in South America, the Middle East, Europe, and now he is going out to the Far East—and that is all very well. He is going to a summit meeting, but he ought to have a summit meeting here in the United States in connection with legislation of this type. I hope the President will get the views of some forward looking and progressive Republicans before he acts on this bill. Having in mind the hundreds of thousands of people in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Ohio, and other parts of the country who are looking with hope to the passage of this bill, a veto would show a heartless disregard for the best interests of the people in these distressed areas as well as a disregard for the best interests of our country as a whole. Only a few days ago, the President referred to this in his message. Of course, we know that his program is innocuous and inadequate. His program will in no way scratch even the surface of this problem. We, in the Congress, undertook to put through a program that he could sign and that he should sign into law. If we had a Democratic President, it would be a much bigger program—as it should be. This is a program calling for $200 million in loans and $51 million in grants. For the $200 million in loans, the local communities and the local interests will spend from 5 to 10 times as much on capital investments. Actually, an investment of $200 million will produce at least $1 billion in the operation of this program. The provision of $51

million in grants will operate in the same way. There again the local communities and the local businesses will spend from $5 to $10 for each dollar that the Federal Treasury puts out. Therefore, this is more than a $251 million program when it comes to its practical operation. The President sent his message to us last Tuesday, and that was rather unusual timing. I do not say the President knew that Calendar Wednesday business would be in order on last Wednesday and that we were going to call the bill up on Calendar Wednesday, but certainly he did send his message up on Tuesday and that made it more embarrassing for those of us who favored this legislation in getting the bill through on Wednesday. The President could have just as well sent his message up last week. He could have sent his message up on Thursday. But somehow or other, it was timed for Tuesday. The message had to be read word for word when on Wednesday the Journal was being read. As we all know, points of order were made that a quorum was not present and every time it was established that a quorum was not present, that meant three rollcalls—which all amounted to a filibuster in an effort to prevent the bill from being considered. Now I do not charge the President with sending up his message on Tuesday in order to interfere with the operation of Calendar Wednesday and to interfere with those of us who favored this bill, but it is an unusual coincidence, that it happened that his message should come to the House of Representatives on the day before Calendar Wednesday. In his message he asked for the cooperation of the Congress—of course, from the Democratic leadership. The other day I said that the President has never asked the Democratic leadership to come to the White House to talk to him about legislation to see where and how we could have a meeting of minds on legislation. This is his eighth year in office. The Democratic leadership on this side of the Congress has never been asked.

We have been invited down for briefings, but that is entirely different. That is entirely different from being invited down to discuss legislation.

Now, we put this bill through. It will be before the President in a short time. I hope he will study it. I hope he will try to get some information in those areas throughout the country where there is at present permanent unemployment and there are human beings, American families, there looking to the breadwinner to bring home food for the family and to pay the rent and take care of other household duties.

I hope the President will cooperate with Congress, and that means with the Democratic leadership. We have put the bill through. He has asked for cooperation, and we have given him the bill. Now let him sign it.

Mr. HECHLER. I appreciate the remarks of my majority leader. I was glad, as I know many Members were, to sit here Wednesday through the many quorum calls, because we could see victory in sight. It was sweet indeed on Wednesday evening, even though it took long hours of rollcalls and quorum calls. I ought to be back in the State of West Virginia right now, because I have a primary opponent in next Tuesday's election. But I believe I am serving the State of West Virginia and the Nation far better by getting up here before the House this afternoon and urging that the President sign this bill.

We have heard much talk about how to balance the budget. I believe in a balanced budget. I believe that we can balance the national budget if people can balance their individual budgets. I believe that can best be done by putting people back to work, through the assistance of the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PROKOP. I am happy to rise and associate myself with my distinguished colleague from West Virginia and preceding speakers in urging the President to sign this most desperately needed legislation. In my particular district we have 16.6 percent of our labor force unemployed. During the last 10 years the people of my area have, through voluntary contributions, spent more than $10 million to try to help ourselves. I believe the people of my area are to be commended for the fine work they have been doing in trying to bring back employment. I believe the President should take heed at this particular time and sign this bill which is so urgently needed by the various sections of this Nation.

I again commend my distinguished colleague from West Virginia for the excellent work he is doing on this particular legislation.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I close by urging the President of the United States to sign S. 722 for the interests of the entire Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the remarks that have been made today calling upon the President to sign the Area Redevelopment Act. I did not expect to speak here today, but when I have heard some of the Members of this House indicate that the President of the United States had no interest or care for the underprivileged and those who are in need and in want, I cannot sit by and not speak out.

I do not believe there has ever been a President of the United States who has the concern of the people more deeply in his heart than has President Eisenhower; and when there is an indication made that President Eisenhower may not know of the want and the distress in some of the areas of the country I just wonder how anyone can make that statement, for the President has been deeply concerned with all the people, and he knows of the need.

The President sent messages here time and time again asking that something be done to relieve these situations. It has not been done until just the other day; and in 6 of the 8 years of the administration the Congress of the United States has been controlled by the Democratic Party with the majority on that side to put through these bills if they were so desperately needed.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Not at this time; I will yield later.

The President asked for fifty-some million dollars and in came a bill for $350 million. I voted against the area redevelopment bill the other day with reluctance, because I may say to the gentleman from West Virginia, I know of the situation in his State and I want his people helped. I know of the situation in Pennsylvania, and I want those people helped, likewise in Kentucky. But as I pointed out on the floor the other day when the bill was being considered, instead of granting the $53 million asked for by the President, which would give adequate help in the areas where it was desperately needed, in came a bill for $350 million. The gentleman from California stated a few moments ago that he would answer questions and tell us how this money would be used. I would like an answer to the question of what you are going to do to rehabilitate Atlantic City, N.J., out of this $350 million.

Oh, it seems to me a shame that you will put in the report of a bill where the people so desperately need help such an item as the one for the redevelopment of Atlantic City. Are the taxpayers of the United States—and they are your taxpayers too—going to be called upon for redevelopment in Atlantic City?

Let me remind you of something I said here the other day. Here is another area that in this $350 million bill you say needs redevelopment, Bristol, Tenn. Let me just read to you briefly about Bristol. This is from the Bristol, Tenn., Chronicle of March 6, 1960. Now, this is an area where you need part of this $350 million to redevelop, you say.

"Area Builders Undergoing the Biggest Boom in History" is the headline:

> Despite the frigidity of one of the worst winters in years, the area's builders are in the midst of the biggest building boom in history.
>
> Either under construction now or planned for the near future is a total of $105,669,231 in major building projects. These projects are within a 50-mile radius of Johnson City.

And it goes on to tell of the great boom. Just look at the RECORD, page 9434, and you will find other areas of Tennessee who say they do not want this help; but they are in here. You say they need help; they say they do not. Many who are in need may suffer because of the irresponsible manner in which this bill has been brought to the floor.

Now, let us face up to the facts.

If the President's bill had been adopted, the bill of the man with a heart,

who believes in taking care of those who need help, calling for $53 million, it would have been signed. But you come to the floor and you beg the President, yes, some have demanded him, to sign a bill that includes in it boom areas and asks all of the people of the country to pay for the redevelopment of boom areas, including Atlantic City.

I said earlier today that they are going to be running the Kentucky Derby tomorrow out in Louisville, Ky. I hope all those people attending the Kentucky Derby will look around at that situation, for Louisville, Ky., is listed in this $350 million bill. If they had adopted the $53 million bill of the President, the man with a heart, who for months has been trying to get this Democrat Congress to do something about it, you would not be here today urging that your people who are so desperately in need be taken care of. It would have been done if you had followed the leadership of Dwight Eisenhower.

Another thing that was interesting to me was to hear it said here today that there were some quorum calls and roll-calls here the other day trying to block this bill. These statements by the same people who were accusing the President of the United States of not having a heart. But I ask you to look at the record. From which side of the aisle did those quorum calls and requests for votes come?

Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentlemen who today have said that the President of the United States has no heart for the people who are downtrodden or up against it or in need will correct that statement. We have had a lot said to us because we send money abroad and we ought to spend it here. With that I agree. My record is such that I can agree. I have not voted to send it abroad. I have always thought we should be doing more for our people. May I say to my colleague from Ohio I have been as much concerned about the Plymouth contract as he is. I think I was the first one to raise the question on the floor of the House. I was concerned about the steel question where steel was purchased abroad and sent over here. But, Mr. Speaker, if you will repeal the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that was started under the Democrat administration and continued on down and adopted by my administration, and when we get rid of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, we will be able to give some real protection to American industry. We will not see some of our industries folding up, and we will not need these redevelopment bills.

So I ask you to join with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], on the other side of the aisle, and myself in this effort. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is one of the great champions of protecting industry. I admire him so much for it for he has in his heart the thoughts of his own people.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I know my colleague wants to be fair. I do not believe in my statement I indicated that the President of the United States did not have a heart. I was merely appealing to him to utilize his heart, and sign the bill. I take it the gentleman from Ohio is opposed to the bill, and would like the President to veto it?

Mr. BOW. My vote will show that I voted against the $350 million bill and if the President vetoes that bill I will vote to sustain his veto. Then I hope the leadership on the Democratic side will bring in the $53 million bill. Let us pass it, let the President sign it, and give your people help, and not indulge in a lot of boondoggling in the amount of $350 million for a lot of areas that do not need it. Let us begin to get some fiscal responsibility.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I sat during weeks of hearings in the State of West Virginia last year on this bill, and the Governor of our State, Republican Governor Underwood, when asked which of these bills would be more efficacious and reach the root of the problems as they exist in West Virginia, responded in the hearings before the Senate subcommittee: "I do think it important and emphasize that the provisions in the bill which you mentioned offering assistance in retraining and economic studies are in my opinion very essential and very helpful." That is on page 995 of the subcommittee hearings.

I submit that the President's bill not containing those items would be of very little assistance in the chronically depressed areas.

I would like to ask the gentleman further, since he mentioned the source of the quorum calls, how he voted on them.

Mr. BOW. I voted wth them. I did not want to see the $350 million bill passed. I would have voted for the $53 million bill, and we could have passed a bill here this week that would have been signed by the President of the United States if you would have accepted it instead of going for the places that I have here pointed out in the boom areas. And, you will find them in the record. They are in the hearings.

Mr. HECHLER. I think, my friend, we have an honest difference of opinion.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. I know the gentleman from Ohio wants to be eminently fair, and I think he is attempting to state the bill as it passed, but I call his attention on page 9458 of the RECORD where the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] was adopted. I appreciate the concern which the gentleman from Ohio has evidenced for my home district of Louisville, and calling attention to the events there tomorrow. But, the bill that passed the House, and the bill that passed the Senate, and the bill which will be before the President by virtue of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], will not include my home city nor probably will it include Atlantic City, nor will it include upon application any other city where the employment level at the time of application is above the minimum set. I see how the gentleman, from looking at the committee report, and in looking at some of the things said earlier, might have reached the conclusion that he did, but the bill that was passed is not the bill which the gentleman describes.

Mr. BOW. I quite agree with the gentleman. It is not the bill I described. But, it is a bill that includes some of these areas. I think the final passage was over $200 million? What was finally passed by the Senate today?

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. The vote on the bill?

Mr. BOW. No. I am talking about the amount involved.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Two hundred and fifty-one million dollars.

Mr. BOW. As against $53 million. And, that $53 million, according to the studies that have been made, would have taken care of the needy.

I am delighted to see that the gentleman's area is not going to be in this bill; that you are in good shape now, and that the Derby will even help you more, because they tell me that the price of mint juleps has gone up, and most of that money stays right in Louisville. And, I am delighted to know that this new industry is flourishing in Louisville.

Mr. Speaker, in closing may I say again that the President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, has done more for the people of this country than any other in our history. This has been proven time and time again. What he does on this bill will be in the best interest of the United States.

To those who have implied the President has no knowledge of conditions, I can only say they are ill-informed or deliberately misstating facts in an effort to gain political advantage.

There should be no partisan politics where human suffering is concerned. It is unfortunate that the earlier remarks of some who have spoken are in that vein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that he has referred to a very old industry, and that the subject of this colloquy was called to my attention first today by the Associated Press. In pointing out to them the true nature of the bill, as being different from that which the gentleman described, I assured the press that the gentleman from Ohio is a very distinguished legislator, but that it was my opinion that as a purveyor of comedy he had poor writers.

FORAND BILL LOBBY BOGS DOWN

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my speech on the floor of the House on Monday, May 2, 1960, I pointed out the inaccurate reporting of the media concerning the pressures on the Congress for the Forand bill.

I hope the various columnists and editors who were telling the people and their Representatives in Congress that the old people were on the march will read the article from the St. Louis Labor Tribune of April 28, 1960, which I am now inserting in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

A LABOR REPRESENTATIVE SPEAKS OUT

(By Larry Connors, directing business representative, Machinists District No. 9)

WANTED: ACTION! ACTION! ACTION!

This is an emergency call for your help to get quick action on the Forand bill in Congress. Letters are badly needed.

The Forand bill is a top priority goal for the organized labor movement. It is urgently needed to help elderly persons meet the skyrocketing costs of sickness.

The bill would: Provide hospitalization, nursing home, and certain surgical benefits for those receiving social security payments. Increase employee and employer contributions by one-fourth of 1 percent of wages each, to pay for the program. Permit choice of doctors, hospitals, and nursing homes by the patient.

The first step in passing this bill is to secure approval by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Here's how you can help. Organize your family, your friends, the neighbors on your block, union members, and anyone else you can think of today, to start writing letters to Congress.

Make sure that all of the people who participate are registered voters. Write the letters in long hand even if your writing is bad. *Tell your* Representatives that you are counting on them to support and vote for H.R. 4700, the Forand bill. Be sure and give your full name and your home address, and give them some of your reasons for wanting the bill passed.

It would be a smart idea to organize some letter writing meetings at homes. Pass the hat around and let someone be responsible for getting the stationery and stamps together. Draw up some chairs to the tables, put on the coffee pot and while the aroma of the percolating brew is giving you inspiration, take your pens in hand and write something like this to your Congressman: (If you are not sure who your Congressman is, call the union office and ask, or call your local postmaster).

"Honorable John Doe,
"House Office Building,
"Washington 25, D. C.

"DEAR SIR: I am a registered voter. I live at (give your address and city).

"I hope you will support and vote for H.R. 4700 the Forand bill to help the aged.

"Very truly yours.

"JANE SMITH."

Then write to your Senators. Their letters should be addressed to the Honorable John Jones, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

The above is just a sample letter. You can add to it or change it, whatever you wish. The important thing is to get the letters rolling in immediately and to let the Members of Congress know that you want this bill passed.

We especially urge those of you whose Representatives may be members of the House Ways and Means Committee to really see to it that they are flooded with mail. Here are the members names:

WILBUR MILLS, Arkansas; AIME FORAND, Rhode Island (author of the bill); CECIL KING, California; THOMAS O'BRIEN, Illinois; HALE BOGGS, Louisiana; EUGENE KEOGH, New York; BURR HARRISON, Virginia; FRANK KARSTEN, Missouri; A. S. HERLONG, Florida; FRANK IKARD, Texas; THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, Michigan; JAMES V. FRAZIER, Tennessee; WILLIAM GREEN, Pennsylvania; JOHN C. WATTS, Kentucky; LEE METCALF, Montana; NOAH MASON, Illinois; JOHN BYRNES, Wisconsin; HOWARD BAKER, Tennessee; THOMAS CURTIS, Missouri; VICTOR KNOX, Michigan; JAMES UTT, California; JACKSON BETTS, Ohio; BRUCE ALGER, Texas; and ALBERT BOSCH, New York.

There are many more signatures to the Forand bill that will benefit not only our neglected aged, but younger working people too.

SEVENTY-SIXTH BIRTHDAY OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL], paid a well-deserved tribute to Harry S. Truman as he approaches his 76th birthday on Sunday, May 8.

I wish to associate myself with Mr. RANDALL'S remarks, for he certainly sets forth the fine caliber of the man and the fine caliber of a devoted public servant.

Mr. Truman is a man of decision, whether in or out of public office. He is a forceful reminder that in the complex, ever-changing world in which we live firm leadership is the pressing need of our time.

I salute the gentleman from Missouri on his birthday and wish him continued good health and happiness in the years to come.

INVESTIGATION OF EMPLOYMENT, UTILIZATION, AND RETENTION OF OLDER FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 5, 1960, I introduced House Resolution 522 which provides for a special investigation and study on the employment, utilization, and retention of older workers in the Federal Government. The purpose of the investigation and study will be to insure the adoption of a general policy by the Government for attracting and retaining the skills, abilities, and training possessed by older persons. Such a policy should contribute measurably to the economy and efficiency in the operations of the Government. Appropriate consideration of older persons should also facilitate more effective recruitment and retention by the Federal Government of an adequate work force of civilian personnel in positions at all levels of responsibility.

This study will be another step toward alleviating some of the more pressing problems of the aged which I consistently have been attempting to overcome by my support of legislation to increase benefits of the aged under the civil service retirement plan, social security, and Railroad Retirement.

It is well recognized that the average age of the population in the United States increases from year to year. By 1985, approximately one-half of the population of the country will be over 45 years of age. This means that an increasingly large segment of the work force and of the population available for appointment to new or different jobs in the Government service have the maturity, skills, and abilities, which come only from long experience in their chosen fields. It is essential that steps be taken to insure that the Federal Government does not fail to utilize these values in the older members of our work force as a result of shortsighted overemphasis on the recruitment of younger less-experienced trainee-type individuals for responsible positions in the Federal service.

The recruitment of young college-trained technical and professional people is essential to meet the needs of Government in these dynamic times. It is equally important, however, in my view, that we maintain a proper balance in the work force by giving attention also to the recruitment and utilization of workers whose special talents and skills have been enhanced by longer experience.

Some of the special problems relating to the older workers in Government were disclosed during recent hearings on office automation conducted by the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics, of which I am chairman. It was shown during these hearings that frequently the jobs which are eliminated as a result of automation are held by older employees with long years of service. The same kind of situation frequently is found where reorganizations occur as a result of changes in the missions of Federal agencies. It is important in these circumstances that there be continuing emphasis on programs for the training and retraining of such employees to insure the continued effective employment in the Government wherever possible. I am convinced that programs of this sort are necessary, not only to protect the equitable rights of the employees, but, also, as a practical matter to protect the substantial Government investment which is represented by the long careers of these valuable public servants.

A recent study conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics concerning the productivity of office workers disclosed that Government agencies had a higher percentage of employees over age 55 than do private companies. Conversely, the private concerns had a much higher ratio of employees under age 25. This results in part from certain measures which now exist to protect the interests of older persons in connection with Federal employment; for example, a maximum age limitation for most Federal jobs is prohibited by law. The procedures for conducting reductions in force also placed emphasis on length of service which tends to favor the older worker. While these and other measures had some effect, the investigation I am proposing would be directed to insuring that there be continuing attention to the problem of the older worker and that such additional measures as might be necessary are installed to insure that there is no discrimination on the basis of age in connection with the appointment or retention of persons in the civilian service of the Government.

ALL GROUPS AGREE ON A SOLUTION TO THE FARM PROBLEM—WHY NOT ADOPT IT?

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FLYNN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 360 million acres of land producing crops in the United States. Productivity of this land has increased faster than the population. Productivity has increased faster than the need of the people for the produce that is grown. We have attempted, at tremendous expense, to store, to hold in reserve, to sell to foreign countries or to barter away the surplus. None of these programs have worked and there has been much waste and the loss of billions of dollars annually to the American taxpayer in an attempt to solve the problem of overproduction and surplus.

The cheapest and easiest way of solving the problem of overproductivity and surplus and the best way of bringing domestic supply into balance with domestic demand is to remove from production, a sufficient number of acres to accomplish this result. When supply balances with demand, the economic laws governing all business will apply, and farmers will be able to receive a fair price for their products. I introduced a bill last year calling for the removal of 80 million acres of land from production. I discussed, at great length, this proposal during my last campaign. I am happy to see that in 1960, most major farm bills and almost all farm groups approve this method of solving farm surpluses and overproduction. The Agriculture Department now recommends the removal of 60 million acres of land from production. The Farm Bureau supports this position. The Poage bill, under the formula contained therein, would remove from 50 million to 80 million acres of land from production. The farmers union and the Grange support this measure. The Iowa farm conference last October recommended the removal of 70 million acres of productive land. Several farm bureau local organizations concur in the 70-million-acre figure. I believe that this shows that all major bills and groups have one common denominator in their approach to the solving of the farm problem. Why, therefore, can we not agree upon a farm bill that will use this basic approach as a means of solving the farm dilemma.

I have introduced bill H.R. 12005 and am having it printed at the end of this statement. I sincerely urge you to examine it. I believe that it will bring domestic production into balance with domestic consumption within 3 years, and that it will enable the Government to dispose of its existing surplus within another 3 years, or less. I believe that all of this can be done at a cost of less than $2 billion a year. This will be about 25 percent of the cost of the existing program. It will be a price that the American taxpayer and the urban dweller can afford to pay to assist the farm economy.

I propose to permit farmers to rent their entire farm minus the buildings not to exceed 5 acres of land. I propose to permit farmers to rent parts of their farm and I propose to remove the mandatory features that other bills contain. I propose to free the farmer from the dictation of bureaucrats operating out of local CCC offices. I propose to return the farmer as a free enterprise citizen to the complete control and usage of his farm.

Investigation has shown conclusively that there are three categories of farmers:

First. The elderly man that would be willing to lease his entire farm minus the buildings to the conservation reserve and use the annual rental as a retirement annuity.

Second. There is the middle-aged man who would be willing to reduce his operation by 25 percent or more and thus have some spare time which he could devote to other activities such as local politics or some outside business interest. I propose to let these individuals choose whether they desire to rent part of their farm or their entire farm.

Third. There is then the young married man who desires to farm a large acreage and who has the health and ability to do so. I propose to permit him to become as big as he desires. He will benefit from the fact that large acreage has been removed from production and he can look forward to receiving a fair price for the reason that supply will be in balance with demand on a national basis.

I have set aside 1 hour to discuss the farm problem, and this plan in particular, on Thursday, May 12, at the conclusion of all other business before the House. I would be pleased to have as many Congressmen as possible participate in this discussion in order that we might determine whether there is any common meeting of the minds on a plan that could be enacted into law during the present session.

H.R. 12005

A bill to balance domestic supplies of, and domestic demand for, agricultural commodities, and to prevent the loss of soil, farm labor, and farm capital resources, by providing for withdrawal of up to eighty million acres from agricultural production

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 101. This Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Production Stabilization Through Conservation Act".

SEC. 102. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to eliminate the recurrence in the future of burdensome surpluses of agricultural production by reducing the acreage in production to the extent necessary to bring into balance the domestic supply of, and the domestic demand for, agricultural products, and to prevent the loss of soil, farm labor, and farm capital resources. It is intended that existing surpluses be disposed of through such other programs as the Congress may by law authorize or direct, including the food stamp plan and the food-for-peace program.

SEC. 103. It is the intention of the Congress that the programs authorized by this Act be carried out in the various sections of the country as nearly as may be practicable in proportion to the competitive desires of producers to participate therein.

SEC. 104. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) The term "Corporation" means the Commodity Credit Corporation.

(3) The term "county committee" means a county committee established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (7 U.S.C. 1831(d)).

(4) The term "acreage allotment" means an acreage allotment made pursuant to the agriculture laws of the United States.

(5) The term "farm" means the land constituting a farming unit as determined by the Secretary, taking into consideration the use of common work stock, equipment, labor, management, and other pertinent factors.

SEC. 105. In the execution of the programs authorized by this Act, the Secretary of the Corporation shall have due regard for the interests of tenant farmers and sharecroppers.

TITLE II—CONTRACTS

SEC. 201. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is directed to determine and announce the national conservation reserve goal and the program applicable thereto for each year not later than March 1 of the preceding year. Not later than thirty days after enactment of this title the Secretary shall announce the national goal and program for 1961. The Secretary shall enter into contracts pursuant to the provisions of this title at a maximum rate approximating twelve million acres increase per year, until such time as the conservation reserve shall reach the smaller of eighty million acres, or a level at which the Secretary finds that agricultural commodity surpluses are being diminished in an orderly manner. Thereafter new contracts or contract riders pursuant to section 203(b) shall be entered into which shall maintain the conservation reserve at such level not in excess of eighty million acres as the Secretary finds to be in the public interest. The Secretary shall not enter into contracts which will result in the conservation reserve acreage's exceeding one-third of the total cropland of any county in which crop production is a major factor in the economy of a

trade area without approval of a majority of those firms located in that trade area whose income is deemed to be substantially dependent on sustained crop production.

SEC. 202. Any such contract shall be of a duration of not less than five and not more than twenty years, and shall be with the person or persons (hereinafter referred to as the contractor) who own or control the farm which is the subject of the contract. Any such contract may contain such provisions relating to transfer of the property which is the subject thereof, assignment, and termination, and such other provisions, as may in the opinion of the Secretary be necessary or appropriate in the public interest and to assure equitable treatment of contractors.

SEC. 203. (a) Any such contract shall provide that the contractor shall place in the conservation reserve, subject to the provisions of subtitle B of the Soil Bank Act and regulations issued thereunder, an acreage which prior thereto accounted for at least 25 per centum of the total crop-producing capacity of the land in the farm which is eligible for the conservation reserve. And not recently cropped which is brought into cultivation within the three years immediately preceding the first year of the proposed contract period shall not be eligible for placement in the conservation reserve until three full years have elapsed.

(b) Any such contract shall describe the boundaries of the conservation reserve acreage, and such boundaries may not be changed without the consent of the Secretary.

(c) Any such contract which is approved after land has been prepared for the planting of an annual crop for harvest in the first year of a contract period, and which places such land in the conservation reserve, shall, at the option of the contractor, permit the harvesting or grazing of the crop for which the land was prepared. This privilege shall apply for only the first year of the contract period and no annual rental payment shall be made on that acreage for the year in which the harvesting or grazing occurs.

(d) Any such contract may contain such other provisions as the Secretary may deem necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this title.

SEC. 204. (a) (1) In consideration of the obligations imposed on a contractor pursuant to section 203, any such contract shall provide that the Secretary shall make payments to the contractor, in cash or in kind, as provided in this section.

(2) For each of the first five years the contract is in effect, the Secretary shall compute for the contractor an annual rental payment determined according to section 107(b)(2) of the Soil Bank Act. Such amount shall be specified in the contract prior to execution.

(3) Upon the expiration of each five-year period after the effective date of the contract, the amount of the annual rental payment shall be adjusted by multiplying the amount determined pursuant to paragraph (2) by the ratio of the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index as of the date of such adjustment to such index as of the first of the year for which the first annual rental payment is due under the contract. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2) and this paragraph, no annual rental payment in excess of $10,000 shall be payable in cash to a producer for all contracts within a State in which he has an interest.

(b) (1) In lieu of the annual rental payments specified in subsection (a) the Secretary shall make surplus commodities available to those contractors who have not placed all of their eligible land in the conservation reserve as specified in this subsection.

(2) Whenever, before land preparation begins for a crop year, the Corporation holds stocks of any commodity which it deems to be critical surplus stocks, the Secretary shall offer a contract rider for that crop year to those contractors with land which prior to being placed in the conservation reserve produced thereon crops currently deemed to be critical surplus crops. If accepted by the contractor the rider shall require reduction of the aggregate acreage of the designated critical surplus crops for the current year below the acreage thereof on the farm prior to placing land in the conservation reserve.

(3) In consideration of the aggregate reduction in critical surplus crops the contractor shall be eligible for a negotiable certificate for a stated number of dollars redeemable in one or more critical surplus commodities chosen by the contractor from those for which an acreage reduction was made in lieu of the cash annual rental which would otherwise be payable.

(4) The value of all negotiable certificates issued under a contract rider shall not exceed the amount obtained by multiplying the total rental under the contract that year by the ratio of the aggregate reduction of critical surplus crop acreage to the total conservation reserve acreage for the farm. In no case shall the value of all negotiable certificates exceed the total rental due under the contract for that year.

(5) Negotiable certificates shall not be redeemable during the normal harvest season of the commodity. Where a negotiable certificate is presented for redemption, the Corporation shall deliver the specified commodity which shall be considered to have a value not less than 80 per centum of the current market price determined by the Corporation at the time and point of delivery. The Corporation shall not be responsible for transporting the commodity from its current location in fulfillment of negotiable certificates.

TITLE III—ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS, MARKETING QUOTAS, AND PRICE SUPPORTS

SEC. 301. Paragraph (7) of the joint resolution of May 26, 1941, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1340(7)), is amended to read as follows:

"(7) A farm marketing quota for wheat shall not be applicable to any farm on which the acreage planted to wheat is ten acres or less."

SEC. 302. For the purpose of determining future acreage allotments and marketing quotas the cropland acreage and the acreage deemed to have been diverted from the production of any commodity in order to carry out a conservation reserve contract shall continue to be deemed to be cropland, or acreage of the commodity, respectively, after termination of the contract as long as the conservation cover or use is maintained in a satisfactory condition.

SEC. 303. The Secretary shall take steps to permit specified grain commodity prices to find their proper free market relationship one toward another as the expanded conservation reserve and surplus disposal programs progressively relieve the surplus situation. In order that adjustments in price relationships shall not be too rapid for any single commodity, the Secretary shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, establish national average price support rates for barley, corn, dry edible beans, flaxseed, grain sorghums, oats, rye, soybeans, and wheat which shall be: (1) for 1961, 95 per centum of the rate in effect for 1960; (2) for 1962, 90 per centum of the rate in effect for 1960; and (3) for 1963, 85 per centum of the rate in effect for 1960. For 1964 and thereafter, price support shall not be offered for these commodities.

SEC. 304. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any contractor who knowingly and willfully grazes or harvests any crop from any acreage in violation of a conservation reserve contract or contract rider shall, in addition to liability for penalties stated in section 123 of the Soil Bank Act, be ineligible for price support benefits that year on all farms in which he has an interest within the State.

SEC. 305. Section 211 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is hereby amended by striking out the words "For a period of three years from the date of enactment of this Act," wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Until directed otherwise by Act of Congress,".

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. GIAIMO), for Friday, May 6, through Friday, May 13, 1960, on account of official business.

Mr. DENT, for Friday, May 6, 1960, on account of official business.

Mr. VINSON for 10 days, starting Monday, May 9, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. HECHLER, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ULLMAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TABER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GROSS) and to include extraneous material at the conclusion of general debate on the bill H.R. 11713.

Mr. BUDGE.

Mr. HARRIS and include an address he made to the Federal Trial Examiners Conference last night.

(At the request of Mr. BURKE of Kentucky, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. RODINO.

(At the request of Mr. QUIE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. WEAVER.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1349. An act for the relief of Song Tai Song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1857. An act to promote the foreign trade of the United States in grapes and plums, to protect the reputation of American-grown grapes and plums in foreign markets, to prevent deception or misrepresentation as to the quality of such products moving in foreign commerce, to provide for the commercial inspection of such products entering such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2087. An act for the relief of Janis Papulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2369. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Halina Konik Wojtusiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2528. An act for the relief of John Lipset; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2575. An act to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2618. An act to authorize the exchange of certain war-built vessels for more modern and efficient war-built vessels owned by the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2627. An act for the relief of Nicholas Anthony Marcantonakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2635. An act for the relief of Maria Genowefa Kon Musial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2739. An act for the relief of Yu Sui Ling, also known as Yee Shui Ling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2769. An act for the relief of John George Sarkis Lindell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2792. An act for the relief of Luigia Mion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2821. An act for the relief of Kristina Selan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2822. An act for the relief of Low Wing Quey (Kwai); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2833. An act for the relief of Sadako Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2857. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for refunds of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2886. An act for the relief of Nikolija Lazic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2923. An act for the relief of Ki Su (Theresa) Moun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2966. An act for the relief of Antigone Apostolaki Cassel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2969. An act to authorize the award posthumously of appropriate medals to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3081. An act for the relief of Irena Maria Koller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3114. An act for the relief of Adolphe Herstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3327. An act for the relief of Joan Goedicke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7947. An act relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association;

H.R. 8684. An act to provide transitional provisions for the income tax treatment of dealer reserve incomes;

H.R. 9660. An act to amend section 6659 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10234. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 9, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 86th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, 17th District, Pennsylvania; DOUGLAS H. ELLIOTT, 18th District, Pennsylvania.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2128. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1960 in the amount of $200,000 for the Department of Justice and $150,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 386); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2129. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DADDARIO: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 11985. A bill to make American nationals eligible for scholarships and fellowships authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 1591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 12117. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 11510. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1593). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 12103. A bill to provide for the free entry of pilot plant grain cleaning and flour milling equipment for Kansas State University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 12104. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12105. A bill to authorize user charges for certain services performed by the Department of Agriculture and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 12106. A bill to eliminate discriminatory employment practices on account of age by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of contracts with the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.R. 12107. A bill to convey Fort Amezquita Military Reservation, P.R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 12108. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency, and for the training of personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 12109. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide that the transportation of bulk commodities by railroad shall be exempt from regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 12110. A bill to provide judicial review of agency orders concerning biological products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 12111. A bill to amend section 2(a) of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 12112. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend by 1 additional year the time within which a minister may elect coverage as a self-employed individual for social security purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12113. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is physically handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 12114. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 12115. A bill to extend the minimum national marketing quota for extra long staple cotton to the 1961 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 12116. A bill to provide for Federal contribution to the cost of election campaigns of candidates for Federal offices, conditioned upon effective control and publication of other sources of financing such campaigns; to encourage small individual campaign contributions and to reduce the importance of large contributions in Federal elections; to provide Federal financial assistance for State voters' and campaign pamphlets; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 12117. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Con. Res. 687. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H. Con. Res. 688. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 12118. A bill for the relief of Maloney Bros. Nursery Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 12119. A bill for the relief of Otilia Maria del Rosario Michelena y Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Helping the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, earlier this session Congressman ADDONIZIO introduced a bill to provide an additional $600 exemption for disabled individuals. Because I have received many letters on this problem, and because my personal experience persuades me that this is an excellent proposal, I wish to support Mr. ADDONIZIO today by introducing a similar bill.

For the past 2 years I have served as Essex County chairman for the Sister Kenny Fund, which in that time raised over $110,000 for the Sister Kenny Institute. In this capacity, I have had the opportunity to learn at firsthand the problems and almost insurmountable difficulties which face the disabled individual in his struggle to achieve economic independence.

The disabled person not only has trouble supporting himself; he has needs and expenses which the average person does not even contemplate. Even such a matter as buying shoes, which most of us take for granted, can become a terrible burden, when the shoes must be specially designed and frequently replaced. A sudden disability may make the family home inadequate, and the family may have to move to a one-story house for the benefit of the disabled member. Taxicabs for those who can no longer use public transportation suddenly become a necessity. Prosthetic devices, specially equipped cars and special equipment for the household are matters which the handicapped must take for granted.

In addition to unique needs and expenses, the handicapped individual faces an uphill struggle in obtaining employment. Attention is now being focused on this problem by the President's Committee on the Physically Handicapped, which is currently meeting.

All these reasons are cogent ones, in my opinion, for giving the disabled some tax relief and thereby helping his economic adjustment.

A precedent for this measure lies in the additional exemption already accorded the blind.

How Do You Stand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 6, 1960

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial by the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER, Senator from Arizona, appearing in the May 3 edition of the Idaho Daily Statesman, published at Boise, Idaho.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona is to be commended for his forthright statement on Americanism. It is a statement which will further endear Senator GOLDWATER to millions of loyal Americans who look to the Constitution of the United States for the protection of their liberty.

The editorial follows:

HOW DO YOU STAND, SIR?

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

How did it happen? How did our national Government grow from a servant with sharply limited powers into a master with virtually unlimited power?

In part, we were swindled. We have elevated men and political parties to power who promised to restore limited Government and who proceeded, after their election, to expand the activities of Government.

But let us be honest with ourselves. Broken promises are not the major causes of our trouble. Kept promises are. All too often we have put men in office who have suggested spending a little more on this, a little more on that, who have proposed a new welfare program, who have thought of another variety of security. We have taken the bait, preferring to put off to another day the recapture of freedom and the restoration of our constitutional system. We have gone the way of many a democratic society which has lost its freedom by persuading itself that if the people rule, all is well.

The Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, probably the most clairvoyant political observer of modern times, saw the danger when he visited this country in the 1830's. Even then he foresaw decay for a society that tended to put more emphasis on its democracy than on its republicanism.

He predicted that America would produce, not tyrants, but guardians. And that the American people would "console themselves for being in tutelage by the reflection that they have chosen their own guardians. Every man allows himself to be put in leadstrings, because he sees that it is not a person nor a class of persons, but the people at large that hold the end of his chain."

Our tendency to concentrate power in the hands of a few men deeply concerns me. We can be conquered by bombs or by subversion; but we can also be conquered by neglect—by ignoring the Constitution and disregarding the principles of limited government. Our defenses against the accumulation of unlimited power in Washington are in poorer shape, I fear, than our defenses against the aggressive designs of Moscow. Like so many other nations before us, we may succumb through internal weakness rather than fall before a foreign foe.

I am convinced that most Americans now want to reverse the trend. I think their concern for our vanishing freedoms is genuine. I think that the people's uneasiness in the stifling omnipresence of government has turned into something approaching alarm. But bemoaning the evil will not drive it back and accusing fingers will not shrink government.

The turn will come when we entrust the conduct of our affairs to men who understand that their first duty as public officials is to divest themselves of the power they have been given.

It will come when Americans, in hundreds of communities throughout the Nation decide to put the man in office who is pledged to enforce the Constitution and restore the Republic; who will proclaim in a campaign speech: "I have little interest in streamlining government or in making it more ef-